DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 496 AC 004 052

By-Ingham, Roy J., Ed.

Institutional Backgrounds of Adult Education; Dynamics of Change in the Modern University. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, 50.

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Brookline, Mass.

Pub Date 66

Note-121p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.15

Descriptors-Administrator Role, College Faculty, *Educational Administration, *Educational Change, Historical Reviews, Institutional Environment, Organizational Change, Power Structure, *Social Change, Student Behavior, Student Role, Teacher Role, *Universities

Originally given at a conference for administrators in higher adult education, these papers by Corson, Clark, Volkart, Becker, Babbidge, and Blau examine processes of educational change in terms of the nature of universities, the role of faculty and administrators, student culture, sources of power and influence, and universities as formal organizations. Corson discusses common impediments to change. Using Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore as examples, Clark describes a method of historical analysis for identifying the character of a given institution. Volkart analyzes the faculty as a source of power; he concludes that such power typically is held by a small minority. In describing student perspectives for coping with their academic and other problems, Becker contends that efforts to change student behavior must take account of these perspectives. Babbidge examines the role of outside groups over the years in bringing about change in the university. Blau suggests implications of administrative relationships, the basic tension between teaching and research, the unclear boundary between universities and the public, and the university's role in fostering social change. (ly)

ED027496

33:

C33: 1987 B9

NOTES AND ESSAYS ON EDUCATION FOR ADULTS 50

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF ADULT EDUCATION

Dynamics of Change In The Modern University

Edited by R. J. INGHAM

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS
at Boston University

AC004052

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Doris Chertow

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Robert F. Campbell, *Clark University*
James T. Carey, *University of California*
John P. Dyer, *Tulane University*
Cyril O. Houle, *University of Chicago*
H. Lichtenstein, *Hofstra College*
Jack London, *University of California*
Ernest E. McMahon, *Rutgers University*
Russell F. W. Smith, *New York University*
Alan M. Thomas, *Canadian Association for Adult Education*
Clifford L. Winters, *Syracuse University*

CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Center publications on education of adults include the *Notes and Essays* series examining purposes and philosophy, *Reports* on methods and practices in the field, *Research Reports* and *Occasional Papers.*

For a complete list and prices write:

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults *at Boston University*
138 Mountfort St.
Brookline, Mass. 02146

$2.00

INSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF ADULT EDUCATION

Dynamics of Change In The Modern University

Edited by R. J. INGHAM
Associate Professor of Adult Education
Florida State University

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**
at Boston University

THE CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS was established in 1951 by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with universities seeking to initiate or improve programs of liberal education for adults. In 1964 CSLEA affiliated with Boston University. The purpose of the Center is to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults.

Copyright 1966 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

PREFACE

The papers contained in this book were presented at a conference sponsored jointly by University College (the Adult Education Division of Syracuse University) and the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, June 13-17, 1965. Financial support for the conference was provided by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education.

The title of this conference was "Dynamics of Change in the Modern University." It was the third in a series of conferences designed to increase the effectiveness of administrative personnel in the adult education divisions of higher education. The first two conferences provided adult educators with an opportunity to discuss the research of psychologists and sociologists and its implications for adult education. It was the consensus of those who planned the third conference that the university administrator would find the selected topic important and directly applicable to his daily concerns.

Although the conference was primarily designed for adult educators, the content is equally valuable for any college or university administrator. Indeed, anyone desiring to understand better the process of change in the college and university will profit from a reading of these papers.

I would like to acknowledge the contribution of James B. Whipple, Associate Director, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults; Dr. Robert Snow, Director of the Center for Continuing Education for Women, University College; and Dr. Roy Ingham, Associate Professor of Adult Education, Florida State University, who assisted in the planning and execution of this conference.

Clifford L. Winters, Jr.
Syracuse University

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION . . . . R. J. Ingham 1

IMPEDIMENTS TO ESSENTIAL CHANGE IN THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY . . . . John J. Corson 7

THE CHARACTER OF COLLEGES: SOME CASE STUDIES . . . . Burton R. Clark 19

ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR AND FACULTY MEMBER IN THE PROCESS OF CHANGE . . . . Edmund H. Volkart 39

STUDENT CULTURE AS AN ELEMENT IN THE PROCESS OF UNIVERSITY CHANGE . . . . Howard S. Becker 59

THE OUTSIDERS: EXTERNAL FORCES AFFECTING AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION . . . . Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. 81

THE UNIVERSITY AS A DISTINCTIVE ORGANIZATION . . . . Peter M. Blau 90

INTRODUCTION

by

R. J. Ingham

Whatever those responsible for its destiny think a university ought to become, it is unlikely that their aspirations will be fulfilled unless they are capable of planning and controlling the process of change. That universities do change is obvious, although the time lag between the first and last institutions to adopt proven innovations is enormous. What is a good deal less obvious is how the process of change occurs. Hopefully, the recent efforts to increase our understanding of how deliberate change can be effected will rapidly diminish our ignorance of this subject; as a consequence, aspirations for higher education may be more nearly realized.

The Significance of the Conference to Administrators in Adult Education

Those who planned the conference identified two reasons why administrators of adult education units should be concerned with the process of change. First, adult education units are themselves changes that have been introduced into the university setting and as such have had to find their way in a complex, imperfectly known, and sometimes hostile environment. Second, the administrator can guide the destiny of his unit in desired directions more capably if he is aware of and able to influence those forces that impede or facilitate change in the university milieu. Both points have been elaborated upon by one of the contributors to this book, Burton Clark. In a previous study he observed that:

> In practice, leadership involves building and adjusting organization to achieve certain purposes. Where we emphasize the *purposive* aspects of leadership, we ordinarily stress also the control of the means by which purpose is to be attained. But leadership is *adaptive* as well, in that purpose usually cannot be achieved unless the organization comes to terms with its environment. A major responsibility of leadership is the working out of satisfactory adjustments between organizations and environmental pressures. Administrators may find that they cannot control changes that are taking place in their organization; or they may not even be aware of the long-run

> drift of affairs. Under more favorable conditions, the leaders may have considerable control over the way their organizations adapt and the consequences that ensue. . . . The exercise of leadership in education, as in other institutional areas, means facing the continuous problems of adjusting organizations and their purposes to environmental pressures, and of understanding and controlling the long-run effects of the adaptations that are made.[1]

It was concluded that a better understanding of these two functions of adult education leaders, the adaptation and control of their organizations, could best be gained by focusing on the process of change itself, for as Nevitt Sanford has observed: "If one knows how an institution might change—what might initiate change and what would be its processes—then there is no question but that he has a good grasp of the functioning of that institution."[2]

What We Know About the Process of Change

The recency of the concern for increasing our ability to plan for change in large organizations is apparent when one notes that Ginzberg and Reilley referred to their efforts to understand the process of change in large organizations as an "exploratory study."[3] These authors point out that "while change has always characterized human life, the deliberate control of change in private enterprises and voluntary and governmental organizations has only begun. The more we understand the process, the more likely it is that we will be able to use our knowledge constructively."[4]

Although the study of deliberate change in complex organizations may be a recent activity, the effort to understand how individuals change in group situations has a longer history. The process of change has been studied along two dimensions. One deals with changes in the system (the "system" may be an individual, group, organization, or community), and the other focuses on change that alters the structure of the system itself.[5] Most of the research on planned change has been devoted to the former aspect and owes a great deal to the pioneering work of Kurt Lewin.[6] Further elaborations upon Lewin's work by Benne and Muntyan[7] and by Lippitt[8] and his associates have contributed to our understanding of the "influence process" defined as a "relationship between persons or groups where one or the other party (or both) utilize some form of interpersonal (or intersystem) operation to induce the other to do, or feel, or think that which the influencer believes is desirable."[9] The authors of this statement consider this to be the "overarching concept" for understanding the process of change.

---

[1] Burton R. Clark, Adult Education in Transition (Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1956), p. 44.

[2] Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962).

[3] Eli Ginzberg and Ewing W. Reilley, Effecting Change in Large Organizations (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957).

[4] Ibid., p. 150.

[5] Robert Chin, "The Utility of System Models and Developmental

Less work has been done analyzing how to bring about planned change in the structure of the system. What is meant by changes to the structure of the system, in this case an organization, is illustrated in the following example:

> Often a management seeking solutions for particular difficulties comes to recognize that nothing short of major changes will be adequate. Such was the case when several years ago the top management of a large company which had grown very rapidly became aware that the personnel division was operating poorly. Reflecting the high centralization that characterized the company as a whole, the personnel department was making decisions involving thousands of people who were working thousands of miles distant from the main office. Investigation disclosed that the operation of the personnel division was only one aspect of a larger difficulty. It became clear that neither the personnel division nor any of the other major divisions could operate efficiently unless organizational changes were introduced that would shift to the field a large part of the responsibility previously carried at headquarters. Nothing short of a fundamental change in the structure and delegation of authority was likely to provide satisfactory relief.[10]

Augmenting the studies that have focused directly on the process of change itself are the vast resources of information about the history,

---

Models for Practitioners," Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin (eds.), The Planning of Change (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), p. 204.

[6] Kurt Lewin, "Group Decision and Social Change," Readings in Social Psychology, Guy Swanson and others (eds.) (rev. ed.; New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952).

[7] Kenneth D. Benne and Bozidar Muntyan, Human Relations in Curriculum Change (New York: The Dryden Press, 1951).

[8] Ronald Lippitt and others, The Dynamics of Planned Change (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1958).

[9] Bennis, Benne, and Chin, op. cit., p. 480.

[10] Ginzberg and Reilley, op. cit., pp. 62-63.

structure, and function of large organizations—businesses, industry, the armed forces, churches, and governmental agencies. Although the university is perhaps the least studied of the complex organizations, our knowledge of this institution is growing too and has been assisted recently by the efforts of behavioral scientists.[11]

Studies of university adult education organization and how it relates to the parent institution have also been conducted. Although the literature on this subject is limited, the work of Carey[12] and Daigneault[13] has provided insight into some of the structural arrangements that influence the process of change within adult education divisions.

There is undoubtedly an integral relationship between the two components of change, which might be termed, respectively, the "human" and the "structural" components of the process of change. In reality, these two components never exist in isolation one from the other. A change in one brings about changes in the other in a never ending cycle. This relationship was noted by Benne and Muntyan in their study of one aspect of the structure of the public school—the curriculum. They observed that "however else the problem of curriculum change may have been formulated, it has not been generally seen as a problem of changing the human relationship structure of the school seen and analyzed as a social system."[14] The understanding of change in complex organizations, then, requires both a knowledge of the influence process as applied to individuals and a knowledge of how the structure of complex organizations might influence change.

Strategy of the Conference

The conference was limited to a consideration of the latter topic, and, as indicated in the title, with the university as a particular type of complex organization. Thus, the intent of the conference was to examine the process of change by focusing on the structural components of the university rather than the human relations or interpersonal dimensions.

---

[11] Sanford, op cit.

[12] James Carey, Forms and Forces in University Adult Education (Chicago: CSLEA, 1962).

[13] George Daigneault, Decision-Making in the University Evening College (Chicago: CSLEA, 1963).

[14] Benne and Muntyan, op. cit., p. 3.

The six components selected for discussion were: (1) the essential character of a university, (2) the faculty and administrators, (3) the external environment, (4) the students, (5) the loci of power, and (6) the distinctive aspects of the university as a formal organization.

Implications for Administrators

No attempt will be made here to investigate what implications the ideas contained in these papers have for administrators. But as an illustration of how these ideas may be of value to the administrator, a brief discussion of one problem confronting the adult education administrator will be presented. The administrators of adult education units in colleges and universities have long felt they occupy a less-than-favored position in the larger institution, and as a result could not bring about the kinds of changes they desired. Some different ways of looking at the administrator's position were introduced in the ideas of Blau and Volkart.

Blau makes a distinction between the administrator as "manager" and the administrator as "executive leader." The former "conceives of his responsibility as finding the most efficient solution to administrative problems" while the latter "accepts the premise that dynamic developments produce dilemmas that cannot be definitely resolved. Hence, the executive leader does not impose solutions once and for all, but he accepts responsibility for making recurrent adjustments." The value of this information for adult education administrators is that it presents a new perspective from which he may view his role. He is typically confronted with situations possessing conflicting aspects where a "remedial action in one respect typically intensifies difficulties in another, requiring further remedial action." Perhaps the energies now consumed by feelings of frustration because of inability to bring about the "most efficient solution" to a problem, could be directed toward developing strategies that would anticipate the "recurring adjustments" (described in more detail by Volkart) that will inevitably demand his attention.

Other implications for current administrative problems await the creative mind of the reader.

The Conference Papers

The papers which follow deal specifically with the process of change in one type of large organization, the university, and thereby add to the limited knowledge that exists about this subject. Some of the ideas presented in the papers support and elaborate the themes expressed in the other papers, thereby contributing to our confidence in the validity of these ideas. On the other hand, some of the formulations and analyses presented provide fresh insights both in the theoretical and applied realms.

The effort that has gone into the publication of this volume will be well spent if the conversation of adult educators at subsequent meetings is in part influenced by these ideas.

IMPEDIMENTS TO ESSENTIAL CHANGE IN THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

by

John J. Corson

Corson examines the central role of leadership in the process of change. From his analysis of six examples of "essential" change in universities, Corson identifies four major impediments to change that are generally encountered. They are: (1) the individualism of the faculty member, (2) the isolation of the academic department, (3) the inhibition of the dean or vice-president for academic affairs, and (4) the inertia of presidents and trustees. It is Corson's position that whatever changes do take place are primarily attributable to forces external to the university—a position also held by Dr. Babbidge in his paper.

John J. Corson is Professor of Public and International Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University. He has also been director of major federal agencies (including the U. S. Employment Service) and a consultant to industry, government, and higher education on management and economic problems. In addition, he has been an adviser on problems of organization to the presidents of Stanford University, Beloit College, the University of Chicago, and the State University of New York. He is the author of The Governance of Colleges and Universities (1960), and Public Administration in Modern Society (1963).

Change, it has been said, is one of the primary laws of life. Organizations—like organisms of many sorts—change continually, in relation to the environment in which they exist, in response to the needs of their constituencies, and in reaction to the desires and objectives of their members; or they cease to exist.

The college or university is no exception to this universal law. To put it in the eloquent words of Lord Lindsay, a noted English educator, universities "can be their beautiful selves only if they are something else as well, and remember that just as they are served by, so they must serve the community. They have to serve the community in their own characteristic way. They are not to do everything the community may ask them to do if that would destroy their higher powers of giving the community what other institutions cannot give it; but supply its high needs they must . . . it would be expected therefore that as society changes, and as its needs change, the universities will change also."[1]

But it is generally agreed that the college or university is slow to accept change. Indeed Columbia University's Paul Mort declared that institutions of higher education take, on the average, twenty-five to thirty years to install proven innovations. How then does the essential change to which Lord Lindsay referred get initiated? On the other hand, what blocks delay and make change difficult? I will not answer these questions in abstract terms. That has been done with some success by other observers. If we are to add to the thought they have focused on the matter, we must follow the advice of another scholar, who contended that if one would avoid thin and profitless generalizations, one had better handle the building blocks carefully. Hence, I propose: (a) to identify six kinds of change that illustrate the problem of effecting essential change; and (b) on the basis of the observations of such change, draw conclusions as to the process of change within institutions of higher education.

Rebuilding a Department

In almost any college or university one or more departments will be lagging behind at any moment in time. The cause may be the rapidity of developments within a particular field and the inability or failure of the members of the department "to keep up." Often the cause is the obsoles-

---

1. The University and World Affairs, the report of a committee created by the Ford Foundation at the request of the Department of State, December, 1960.

cence of the department chairman, and the lack of real leadership. The frequency of this problem—the rebuilding of a department—makes it an especially useful example of a kind of change that needs be effected.

Two illustrations will illuminate the problem of inducing the required change. One deals with the economics department of a southern state university. The department included eight or ten man of tenure rank and an equal number of younger teachers. Its tenure staff had all grown old simultaneously. Their productivity as scholars had disappeared sometime back. The number of Ph.D. applicants had fallen off. The undergraduate enrollment in courses was large, but there was little evidence of inspiring teaching or of student interest. Invitations to scholars in other institutions to fill vacancies were rejected with discouraging frequency.

The second illustration involves the chemistry department in a western university. The symptoms were similar. Here, however, they were underlined by the great prestige and marked advance of other science departments on the same campus.

In the first instance, the dean of the undergraduate college prevailed upon the president to appoint an inter-departmental committee from the faculty to nominate a new chairman for the economics department.[2] The department considered this action a calculated affront. The committee, however, persisted in its task, came up with a recommendation acceptable to the department itself, and gained approval for the appointment. Within a period of three years, the new chairman had replaced four retiring members with new appointees who were attracted in some part by the new chairman himself. A younger, more enterprising department had been built; time will reveal more about its quality.

It was the president who insisted upon and effected change in the second illustration. He prevailed upon the chairman to set an early date for his own retirement, and in anticipation of that time to aid him (the president) in seeking not only a replacement, but also two additional senior members for the departmental faculty. Additional funds were budgeted and new salary ceilings were set so that the president might bid for the services of truly accomplished and prestigious men. The effort was notably successful.

---

[2] The common use of this device is suggested by Lloyd S. Woodbourne, Principles of College and University Administration (Stanford University Press, 1958), p. 47.

Change in these illustrations was effected successfully. In many other instances change is not accomplished. What are the impediments that make the revitalization of a department that has run down especially difficult? At least three factors can be identified:

1) The lack of a hierarchical superior with clear authority and responsibility for the effectiveness of each department—the dean's superior authority is limited in scope and circumscribed by his inability to remove the chairman, or in any other way to compel the consideration of proposals he might make;

2) Unyielding disciplinarianism—the prevailing view that only department members are conceivably qualified to appraise the qualifications of a new chairman means that change must originate at an unlikely source;

3) Inhibition on the part of the dean and/or president—they are usually inhibited by the prevalence of the view that only members of the discipline can or should nominate members of its department; they are also often prevented from initiating change by the competing demands for their time—or a simple lack of enterprise or courage.

Introducing a New Curriculum

Changes in the manpower needs of our society impel a succession of changes in the product of the college or university. But changes in curricula require of teachers changes in long-established habits of mind, as well as in ways of doing things. Mature men must be helped to develop new intellectual concepts and new behavior patterns.[3] The difficulties that are involved have been illuminated by the experience of a respected eastern liberal arts university in establishing a new, and the first, professional school on the campus. What has emerged is not actually a new professional school, but a new catalog listing mostly old courses (in some instances under new titles). Courses previously offered for the education of scholars and teachers are now offered to men who expect to practice rather than teach.

Why has the introduction of a new curriculum not been effected? The difficulty was not rooted in any lack of resources. Nor can it be blamed on any lack of demand for training in the new field. Instead the cause is the inability of a good liberal arts faculty to accept the need for modifying courses originally designed to educate students for careers in research and teaching in order to serve students looking forward to careers as practitioners. A second cause was the lack of a leader within the faculty capable of leading his colleagues in formulating the new curriculum, of developing new intellectual concepts, and of persuading the "establishment" within the university faculty of the need for change.

---

[3] For analysis of the difficulties involved in developing new intellectual concepts and new behavior patterns see Eli Ginzberg and Ewing W. Reilley, Effecting Change in Large Organizations (Columbia University Press, 1957), particularly Ch. 3, "Psychological Factors in Change," pp. 40-60. This volume was one of the first orderly attempts to explore the difficulties of inducing change in large organizations.

Conversion of Teachers' Colleges

A third illustration is similar in kind but much more general in application. It is the widespread effort to convert onetime state-supported normal schools (later teachers' colleges) into four-year liberal arts colleges. Any generalization as to the success with which this change has been effected, the country over, is subject to large error. But the consensus of most informed observers is that such change as has been accomplished has come slowly, and that in many states only superficial accomplishment has been achieved more than two decades after the objective was agreed upon.

Why? A summary answer is essentially that the causes that prevented the introduction of a new professional curriculum in a liberal arts university has prevented reverse change (from an applied to a liberal arts curriculum) in the former teachers' colleges. It has been extremely difficult or impossible to induce teachers whose behavior patterns had been established in the teachers' colleges to alter these patterns and to formulate new intellectual concepts. In some instances their resistance to change has been reinforced by the resistance of the state education association. Where real liberal arts colleges were established promptly, outstanding leadership was found in the person of a dean or a president who deeply believed in the objective.

Establishment of Two-Year Medical Colleges

In at least two major institutions, notable change has been effected despite the prevalence of blocks similar to those that delayed or prevented change in the two previous illustrations. The institutions are Brown and Dartmouth. The change that has been effected in each is the establishment of a two-year medical college. The force that has impelled consideration of this innovation is the urgent demand for a greater number of physicians.

This demand is reinforced by the availability of federal funds. And in each instance there was wise and effective leadership to sell the changes involved to the faculties.

The establishment of a two-year medical college may require the adjustment of established course offerings in the sciences. It may be interpreted as threatening the existing departmental hierarchy with the invasion of their curricular provinces. Moreover, the establishment of a medical college (especially if it is contemplated that the two-year medical college may be expanded into the conventional four-year college in the future) poses the threat of a voracious competitor for the university's available resources. Despite these stimuli to conventional opposition, these medical colleges were established. How and why? My conclusions are based on limited evidence, but that evidence seems clear. In each institution the president took a forceful leading role in bringing the new medical college into being. He used the weight of his trustees' interest in the move. He invited full faculty collaboration in the development of plans for the new college (or curricula). And, finally and importantly, he left control of the curricular offerings and faculty assignments and promotions effectively in the hands of the established departments.

Change in the Agricultural Colleges

A fifth illustration of change in academic institutions offers a notable contrast. In most or all agricultural colleges in this country the curricula have been changed significantly within the past two decades. This change has been caused by the basic shift of this country from an agricultural to an industrial civilization. This basic shift has resulted in the loss of students in the agricultural colleges while enrollments in other colleges on each campus grew; the loss of students was itself a major impetus to change. The clientele groups—the farm organizations and the agricultural industry groups—insisted upon change from the old style agricultural training. Fear that finances were drying up constituted another influential impetus. Proposals by prominent scholars for reorientation of the agricultural college curricula made the change in concepts that was involved easier to accept. Finally, the agricultural colleges' loss of status on the campus of the land-grant institutions drove them to find new claims to academic respectability.

The blocks that deterred or prevented other forms of change were overwhelmed by the effects that emerged from the root cause cited above. Indeed the experience of the agricultural colleges reveals precisely what theorists have predicted as to the course of organizational change. March and Simon have stated that:

> When the environment create(s) a new problem for a number of organizations,
>
> 1) There will be a period after awareness of the problem has spread during which actual innovation will be very slow.
>
> 2) Once an acceptable solution . . . has been invented and introduced in one such organization it will spread rapidly.
>
> 3) Innovation will be greatly increased for a short time if a group of new persons from a sub-culture not previously strongly represented in the organization is introduced into it.[4]

So it was in the agricultural colleges. The recent study of American colleges of agriculture directed by Charles E. Kellogg and supported by the Carnegie Corporation traces the course of organizational change. The problem created by the dwindling away of the farm population and the marked change in agricultural technology is clear. Before responsive innovation commenced there was indeed a period after enrollments began to decline when questions were raised as to the relevance of the curricula to the needs of American agriculture and related fields. The ideal change is not yet clear, but the solutions that have been tried, particularly those sponsored by prestigious scholars (e.g., John Black of Harvard University) were adopted by many institutions. Change was effected more rapidly in those institutions into which new faculty members with "pure" natural and social science backgrounds and training were introduced. Few are bold enough yet to assess the change that has taken place in the curricula of the agricultural college. Yet marked and substantial change has been effected in the same institutional setting in which other change has been slow or non-existent.

Federal-Induced Change

Most university campuses are replete with illustrations of change induced by grants and contracts from the federal government. The federal largess is (in the eyes of the academic administrators, if not the faculty members) not always an unmixed blessing. Federal grants, it has often been pointed out, create an imbalance among faculty departments; they consume the energies and interests of the natural scientists, sometimes limiting the energy they devote to teaching. They provide a markedly lesser stimulus for teachers in the humanities. Federal grants also affect the quality of teaching, teaching methods and curricula; as to the nature of this effect there are many contrasting opinions.

---

[4] James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 188-89.

Other implications of the change fostered by federal support could be cited.[5] The problem that attends such change is twofold. Is the grant-supported work of value to the institution as distinguished from the value it has for the individual (or individuals) for whose work the grant is made? To what extent can the academic officers influence or control the change that is induced by the availability of federal funds? How can they do so?

Impediments to Change

The foregoing six illustrations provide an adequate basis for identifying the usual impediments to change in the college or university. Four impediments, each described by a word commencing with the letter I, are apparent.

The first is the individualism of the faculty member. As a scholar he is granted an independence in determining what he will teach that distinguishes him from men of like rank and professional competence in business, the government, or the military. Moreover, his interest is in a subject-matter field and only secondarily in the curriculum of which his courses are a part. His future as well as his innate desire is in his discipline, not in the institution that pays his salary.

The second impediment is the isolation of the academic department. This isolation is bred in the narrow specialization that characterizes the department and the narrower specialization of its members. This specialization isolates the individual from his peers and from those in the outside world who deal with real and whole problems, not abstract problems torn from a context of reality. This specialization tends to discourage, delay, and sometimes to prevent change. Traditionally the discipline, and the department that is its voice, has striven to "crush new potential disciplines which might threaten its control over funds or students."[6] David Riesman has dubbed them the "Veto Groups" of academic life, a title which others have agreed they have fully earned.[7]

---

[5] The significance of federal support and its impact on academic administration has been studied extensively. See, for example, Harold Orlans, The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education (The Brookings Institution, 1962), a study of 36 universities and colleges.

Caryl Haskins has pointed out that the growth of organizations leads to complexity, complexity to specialization, and specialization to a dynamic interplay of independence and integration.[8] The department is a product of the increasing specialization of knowledge.[9] But the very subdivision that results from yet further increasing specialization tends to isolate the department from the environment in which it operates. Its members increasingly confine their attention to narrow boundaries of knowledge within their own disciplines. The interplay among departments, and especially between the department and the environment, which generates such problems as the greater need for trained physicians or the need for teachers with broader liberal viewpoints, little influences most departments.

The nature and extent of change that is accepted by the department is directly correlated, in most instances, with the strength, wisdom, progressiveness, and permanency of the departmental chairman. A wise chairman with the respect of departmental members can achieve change. But the prevalence of such chairmen is limited; such men are scarce and the number serving as departmental chairmen is further limited by (a) the custom in many institutions of rotating chairman, and by (b) prevailing mores of academia that dictate that a scholar should not serve in such an administrative capacity for more than a brief time.

The third block to change in a college or university is the inhibition of the dean (and of the provost or vice-president for academic affairs in those institutions where such posts exist). He is inhibited first by the disciplinarianism which implies that not being a member of the discipline he does not have the competence to participate in decisions about courses offered or the qualifications of those who shall teach them. If this cause of his inhibition be stated in extreme terms, it is done so because, as Stephen Leacock pointed out many years ago, "A half truth, like a half brick, carries best in argument."

---

[6] David Riesman (ed.), Constraint and Variety in American Education (University of Nebraska Press, 1956), p. 94.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Cited by James A. Perkins in "The New Conditions of Autonomy," an address before the American Council on Education, October 1, 1964.

[9] A brief and effective description of the historical evolution of the department is found in Beardsley Ruml and Donald H. Morrison, Memo to a College Trustee (McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 232.

He is inhibited also by the denial of the authority that an officer of like rank in a business or governmental organization exercises. He cannot direct a departmental chairman, nor can he remove a chairman who is totally incompetent, let alone unco-operative. Hence, he is often unable to influence the course of the change that is being wrought by the acceptance of federal grants or contracts or as a consequence of environmental developments (such as the plight of the agricultural colleges). He may strive to throw his weight around through the control of the instructional budget, but this instrument is usually a weak tool of leadership. A major portion of the budget is made up of the salaries of the existing members of the department; the flexible portion of the budget (usually "the new money") will usually be a small part of the total. Moreover, the independence of many departments is heightened by the availability of federal grants or foundation money. Of course, there *are* able and successful deans. Such change as they effect is usually a result of a high order of tact and persuasive skill.

The fourth impediment to effecting change in colleges and universities is the *inertia* of presidents and trustees. That inertia is bred in (a) the same factors that impede action by the department chairmen and the deans, and in (b) the monopolization of their time by other demands (e.g., for the raising of funds, the handling of physical facility problems, the nurturing of alumni, the supervision or promotion of athletics, and a myriad of non-educational matters). The first of these causes of inertia is described in the words of three "old hands." Harold Dodds, long-time-president of Princeton University, has written that for many presidents "to be identified as the proponent of a new idea is the kiss of death for it."[10] John Millett, formerly president of Miami University of Ohio, and now chancellor of the Ohio system of higher education, has written: "Any attempt to introduce policies or practices which suggest a role of superordination for the professor on the other hand will almost inevitably produce conflict."[11] As Barnaby Keeney, president of Brown University for the past decade, has quaintly pointed out: "The best way to get your own ideas across is to have someone else think them up."[12]

---

[10] Harold Dodds, *The American President—Educator or Caretaker* (McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 49.

[11] John D. Millett, *The Academic Community: Essay on Organization* (McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 232.

The gist of what these men say, which comes from an aggregate of more than a half-century's experience, is that a university is so constituted that the faculty will not like an idea that they know is the president's (or the trustee's) even if it is good. This is a sociological fact of life that constitutes an obvious brake on change.

The trustees as representatives of the public interest might well be expected to be the instruments of change—but they very, very seldom are. They are leaders, and they might be expected to relate the outside world to those within who plan curricula and select personnel. But this function is seldom granted to (or accepted by) the trustees of public or private institutions. B. Ruml in his controversial little volume, Memo to a College Trustee, pleads with trustees to reclaim from the faculty the responsibility for the education program. Paul H. Davis, an experienced observer of many universities, wrote recently, "The responsibility for education rests in the boards of trustees. Yet most of the boards have abdicated that responsibility." By citing Ruml's and Davis' views, I am not suggesting, as Ruml did, that the trustees insist upon framing the educational program. I am only suggesting that in an area where continual change should be considered, trustees seldom serve as a vigorous agent of change. They could stimulate change if they would insist upon asking questions about every educational matter that they can smoke out. The knowledge that questions will be asked, and that proposals will be discussed will ensure better and more broadly based decisions, and also much better preparation of proposals.

Change Does Take Place

Yet despite these blocks, there are notable instances of advance by many colleges and universities. In considerable part, this advance must be attributed to pressures from without. Clark Kerr stated this point, in historical and universal terms, when he wrote: "The truly major changes in university life have been initiated from the outside, by such forces as Napoleon in France, ministers of education in Germany, royal commissions and the University Grants Committee in Great Britain, the Communist Party in Russia, the emperor at the time of the Restoration in Japan, the lay university governing boards and the Federal Congress in the United States—and also, in the United States by the foundations."[13]

---

[12] In a personal letter to the author.

James A. Perkins has echoed and illustrated this same fact: "While it is true that many educational ventures have been originated and carried out within the single university, it is equally true that other organizations, some of them designed and established by the universities themselves, are increasingly the source of important ideas for educational improvement. The new mathematics, for instance, was sponsored not by the universities but by the Carnegie Corporation and the National Science Foundation. For ideas on testing we look to the College Boards and the Educational Testing Service, for overseas education we are turning to Education and World Affairs, and for educational television to the Ford Foundation."[14]

Not all advance, however, should be attributed to outside forces. There are a few academic administrators who despite the structural and sociological impediments to change that characterize colleges and universities have induced change and contributed markedly to the development of great institutions. The question for students of the governance of colleges and universities is: Can their task be made easier? Or stated in the words of Clark Kerr the question is: "how to reconcile the conservatism of the collective faculty with the radical function of the total institution."[15]

---

[13] Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Harvard University Press, 1963), pp. 105-6.

[14] Perkins, op. cit.

[15] Kerr, op. cit.

THE CHARACTER OF COLLEGES: SOME CASE STUDIES

by

Burton R. Clark

Clark's thesis is that each institution has a unique historical thrust—its character. He discusses the means by which this character is maintained and transmitted from one period to the next. Changes that run counter to this character, he argues, will encounter greater resistance than those consistent with it. Through the use of three case studies, Clark describes a method of historical analysis by which this institutional character may be identified.

Burton Clark is a research sociologist and professor of Education at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California (Berkeley). He presented one of the major papers at the conference on Sociological Backgrounds of Adult Education held at Syracuse University in 1963, and is the author of Adult Education in Transition (1958), The Open Door College (1960), and Educating the Expert Society (1962).

When we seek the dynamics of change in a college or university, it helps to know what elements of the organization are critical to its nature. The important features, linked together in some fashion, constitute the character of the organization. As in individuals, the character of an organization may be tightly or loosely integrated, distinct or indistinct. Difficult to discern and describe in most cases, we commonly speak of it as intangible. Yet even when character is quite indistinct, we can put our finger on it to some degree. Participants in one organization after another feel their place has a special flavor or style and tell us a little about it. Outsiders who relate closely to an organization often sense that it is, at root, aggressive or passive, experimental or hopelessly wedded to the status quo. The impressions of insiders and outsiders exaggerate and simplify, but usually around a core of truth. There are organizational commitments and avoidances, habits and blind spots, competencies and incompetencies that allow us to predict what the organization will want to do, what it can and cannot do well, and how it will respond to different challenges and pressures.

Our capacity in social research to identify the character of organizations has not proceeded much past the conventional wisdom. There are at present no methodological short-cuts, no quick and easy ways of obtaining the requisite information and insight. This is especially true for colleges and universities; for reasons later discussed, they are unusually complex. A questionnaire mailed out to colleges from a national office only begins to scratch the surface. To attempt to appraise the character of colleges is to create a need for prolonged and intensive probing, a style roughly analogous to the slow case-by-case effort that clinicians use in seeking to understand the character of individuals. The organizational analyst, at a minimum, must go to the campus and roam around, observing what students, faculty, and administrators do in their regular locales of classroom, office, committee room, coffee shop, dormitory, and, in some places, the faculty home. He needs to converse as well as to interview. He needs to read old records as well as to write a questionnaire, to sit with the campus historian as well as the student who is currently in passage.

In order to suggest ways of looking at the character of colleges, I will turn first to three cases drawn from my own research.[1] The colleges are Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore. For each of these institutions, I will summarize developments over a period of forty to fifty years. I will then draw components of character from these cases and offer a rudimentary list that may point to possibilities in other colleges and universities. This will lead to a concluding statement on how a person might go about investigating the character of a college.

---

[1] Research done with colleagues in the Center for the Study of High

Three Cases

Antioch

If we wish to understand the Antioch of today, it helps considerably to turn to the revolutionary change that occurred there in the 1920's. Up to that time (1863-1920), the college had been church-related, locally-based in student body and control, impoverished, provincial, and obscure. In a crisis of impending bankruptcy in 1919, the college was put in the hands of Arthur E. Morgan, an eminent water conservation engineer, who had long dreamed of a radical break from current practice in American education. Morgan combined a utopian vision with considerable personal force and magnetism. His educational philosophy centered on the whole man and he sought a balanced approach that would bring together the practical and the intellectual. Morgan wanted a college in which students would gain a general education—one appropriate to leadership in business and the community—by working and participating in a community as well as by studying in the classroom.

The new president moved rapidly on a number of fronts to make the college an instrument of his ideals. He immediately changed the curriculum to an alternation of study and work, a complex scheme that was modified many times before it settled down to a permanent form. In a position, unusual among college presidents, to shape the board of trustees, he turned in local ministers for nationally known industrialists and bankers. The financial base of the college was quickly expanded manyfold. The president was also able to shape the student body and moved rapidly into the national recruitment pool as he replaced the small group of local boys and girls with a much larger group drawn from afar. He was in a position to shape the faculty, and was able to recruit professors of the kind necessary to the venture he had in mind—sometimes general educationalists of

---

er Education, University of California, Berkeley. Major research reports in preparation.

an extreme sort, as in the case of an Indian philosopher-engineer who taught sociology, and a man whose career at the college was to include teaching in business, teaching in English, and teaching in the dean of students' office. In the late 1920's, the college began to experiment with the forms of student participation in a campus polity that evolved into the college's vaunted Community Government. This government became the backbone of the Antioch conception of campus as community. Morgan was also an effective propagandist, an image-maker, and he stormed the country with newsletters, magazine articles, newspaper accounts, and speeches. He got national figures to give their prestige as "Friends of Antioch"; to have Harvard's President Emeritus Eliot and a rising young politician named Franklin Delano Roosevelt lending their names to the cause was to move rapidly from obscurity to national note. A strong public image of Antioch developed within a decade, an image of a liberal, experimental college with a unique curriculum. The outside impression was critical to a steady stream of appropriate students and faculty. Change went forward on many fronts simultaneously and rapidly, under conditions favorable to change.

Arthur Morgan left the college in the early 1930's and there was significant evolution after his time. But many of the ideals and practices instituted in the twenties to form a new character were carried forward and much of the later evolution was a working-out of Morgan's programs. What were the carrying mechanisms of the second Antioch? The new character was embodied in many aspects of the campus. It was first of all represented in the curriculum, notably in the work-study scheme but also in sequences of courses, levels of achievement, tests, and papers that were addressed to a particular version of general education. A scheme of work, a curriculum, has some momentum of its own; it becomes a prime carrier when the faculty believes in it. The faculty, by official selection, self-selection, and on-campus acculturation became wedded to a particular institutional self-image, one in which the work-study plan and Community Government were specific and salient elements. Their conception of the institution would not, in turn, have been critical if they were powerless. But authority flowed into their hands after Morgan left and their ideals were given a firm power base. Men who were True Believers had the power to protect practices that increasingly took on a certain sacred quality. In short, the values and the authority of the members of the faculty worked together to help institutionalize salient components of transformed character.

The public reputation of the college also snowballed along the tracks established in the 1920's—the tracks of educational progressivism and political activism—as many who were liberal learned to admire the college and as many who were conservative learned to despise it. The outside impressions became strongly fixed, a matter of ingrained sentiment, in many schools, neighborhoods, and social strata. Public image became a prime carrier of institutional character. With the image went a social base that continued to build in the directions set in the 1920's. The base shifted increasingly toward Big City upper-middle-class liberals, those who read The Nation, got psychoanalyzed, and sought progressive schools for their children. Antioch could usually get as many students as it wanted from New York City; but Ohio was constantly underenrolled.

In a brief review we can only mention some of the subtle aspects of the character of a college. At Antioch (to describe it inadequately) there is a subtle blend of a "soft" pacifist, almost rural, morality with a "hard" Big City liberality. Arthur Morgan was a rural man, with rural ideals of reforming society through the leadership of small-town businessmen. The self-recruitment to the college and the evolution of the work plan diverted the institution away from the small town, however, to the big city. The Morgan ideals of community, to the extent they were expressed in faculty personal philosophies, found their support particularly in Unitarianism and Quakerism, a religious spirit that in turn created an opening to the Left, politically, a tolerance for the militant, non-religious reformers who flowed to Antioch to pick up the picket sign. The Unitarian-Quaker outlook reached its peak of development at the college in the 1930's; it has continued to be an important part of the morality of the place, an intangible feature easily missed by the ahistorical observer, especially the one who sends a questionnaire to observe for him. It is a backdrop to the militant political activists who have come on strong since 1945 and whose demonstrations capture public attention.

Looking backward to the transformation of the 1920's and the tools of embodiment and protection constructed in the 1920's and 1930's helps us comprehend the Antioch of post-World War II and the problems it faces. The historical analysis tells us what is relatively old and new in present-day character; it helps illumine what is hard-core belief and what is tactical face-work, in the arguments of Old Staff and Young Turks; it points to what is internal inclination and what is adaptation to modern society in the determinants of action and change.

Reed

Reed is a case study in the preservation of initial commitment. The college took off on the academic high road in 1911 and clung there, more than once by the fingertips, when lack of money and adverse public reaction threatened to push the college over the edge and down the mountainside. Those who wish to know about stubbornness in colleges should study Reed. It has been an unaccommodating institution.

Encouraged by the General Education Board, Reed's first board of trustees decided that what the City of Portland, the State of Oregon, and the Pacific Northwest needed above all in education was a strong, pace-setting liberal arts college. The first president, William T. Foster, was sternly unhappy with the academic flabbiness of American colleges, including his alma mater, Harvard. He set to work to fashion "a Johns Hopkins for undergraduates, the Balliol of America." He and his successors did indeed fashion an all-honors college, with no hiding place for the student, gentleman or otherwise, who might be in search of an easy "C." There were to be no rah-rah intercollegiate sports; no social life that would undermine the classroom, hence no sororities and fraternities; no admission of weak and marginal students "on condition"—then a common practice in even the best of places. Instead there would be a series of major hurdles for all that would insure persistent and serious study: stiff admissions scrutiny; freshmen courses that included seminar-type discussion of great literature; an examination—"the Junior Qual"—to qualify for passage from the junior to the senior year; a thesis in the senior year; an oral examination on the thesis. Relative to other places, there was no escaping the academic travail.

The strictly academic tone of the curriculum and the extracurricular activities became rapidly institutionalized. It was doctrine by the end of the first decade that the student body did not pay attention to the frivolities of college life. Attempts to develop intercollegiate sports, for example, were beaten back by the faculty and students several times. In so doing, the defenders claimed they were being consistent with Reed ideals and tradition and thereby protecting the integrity of the institution.

The college was also inclined from the beginning to be liberal and critical of established institutions. The first president and his associates were high-minded reformers, straight out of New England, eager to cleanse Portland of its sins. They went after the motion picture houses and other dens of iniquity. Some among them, including the president, were outspoken pacifists during World War I. Some were impatient political liberals, including the young sociologist William Ogburn and a young Paul Douglas in economics, reading the new New Republic and beginning a career that would lead to the United States Senate. The values of the faculty were, in short, sharply academic and militantly liberal.

It did not take long for such an institution to create a distinct image that would affect relations with the outside world. By the end of the first decade, local citizens had marked the place as radical and unsound. The public impressions had a snowballing, self-confirming tendency. Liberal professors and students were increasingly attracted to the college. Conservative professors and students and donors were increasingly repelled, or more deeply confirmed in their beliefs about the place. Political myths about the college that waxed at one time and have never to this day been laid to rest completely confuse William T. Foster, the first president, with William Z. Foster, the American Communist leader, and Simeon Reed, entrepreneur and benefactor, with John Reed who lies buried in the Kremlin. As a result, local money dried up and the college took up residence among the poor. What is different about Reed's history from other poverty-stricken colleges is that the college broke the correlation of poorness and mediocrity. The several dozen men who were the senior faculty of the 1920's and 1930's held stubbornly to the ideals established in the first fifteen years, instead of making the compromises that would have allowed them to buy shoes for their babes.

Critical to that stubbornness was the power of the faculty. The college moved toward strong faculty government as early as 1915, upon the heels of a major scandal in academic freedom at the University of Utah. Upon the death of the college's second president in 1925, Reed came under full faculty control. The heavy amount of faculty influence on policy protected the Reed style against more than one president who sought change and against the board and the community when they grew unusually restless about the direction and tone of campus life. With this, administrative strain became a way of life, one out of which the college has begun to work itself in the last six to eight years. As recently as 1954, however, faculty protection of colleagues under political attack from the outside led to a major breach in relations with trustees and the community. Reed presidents rapidly become experts on town-gown relations.

The college's recruitment pool also gradually changed from local to national, as its reputation grew. Reed's students came from Portland and the Pacific Northwest in the early years and the college achieved considerable national prominence without national recruitment. After World War II, students from California and the East increasingly formed the majority. The liberal components of the Reed reputation caused some self-selection by liberal students; as a non-conformist component developed in the reputation, there has been some self-selection by non-conformists. The input characteristics of the students have sped the student culture in its evolution toward a distinctive style of liberal, intellectual non-conformity. The romantic images of the students closed in the 1950's around the activities and appearances of a strident minority who symbolized their detachment and criticism with beards and bare feet—and bare feet on the cold sidewalks of Portland in February is a great deal of symbolism.

I have said enough about Reed to suggest some of the features that have been critical in the forming of its character and the carrying-on of that character from one decade to another. As at Antioch, character was built into a distinctive curriculum and into the way the extracurricular domain of activities was related to the curricular. The faculty became deeply attached to certain ideals and practices; it also became powerful; and that power became a sustaining element. Public image mediated relations with the environment, repelling certain resources and attracting others, and in the process helping to form a social base in a national strata of families that are upper-middle-class, liberal, and culturally sophisticated. Student traditions formed around a combination of stern study, avoidance of the ordinary social life of college students, freedom in personal life outside the classroom, and non-conformity.

Swarthmore

One reason why Swarthmore stands so high among American colleges is that it got around to study ahead of time. Colleges in which study is the major sport were not numerous in the twenties. Colleges were still drawing largely from a local population in which family ties often loomed large; the spirit of the times was kind to the good life in college, for graduate school deans and corporation recruiters were not yet a major force on the undergraduate campus. The elective system was in control, reducing the pressures of the curriculum to the option of the student.

There were always some reforming educators around, however, to worry about the state of educational affairs and attempt to spoil the fun. Among these reformers was Frank Aydelotte, a former Rhodes Scholar, who had Oxbridge firmly in his mind when he assumed the presidency of Swarthmore in 1920. The college had until then led a sheltered if not always quiet life, from the time the Hicksite or liberal wing of the Quakers took out papers in 1864 and dedicated the college to education "under the care of Friends." From its original state as a closely guided Quaker community, the college evolved between 1890 and 1920 into a more worldly center of student life. In came the glee club, the fraternity, and the imposing football schedule in which a small school plays before large crowds and tries to win moral victories by not losing too badly to university giants. The college also developed a substantial physical plant, expanded its faculty gradually, and kept itself firmly based on the Quaker community even as it became ever more like other colleges. The college that Aydelotte inherited was not moribund; it was, he thought, a place with the resources and climate necessary for the reforms he had in mind.

Again, a main avenue of change and embodiment was a distinctive curriculum. The cutting edge and symbol of the leap forward at Swarthmore in the twenties was the Honors Program, a modified Oxford scheme in which some students were put on a special track of intensive seminars in their junior and senior years. But the Honors Program for which the college is so well known was just one among many interlocking changes introduced in the twenties. A change in character is the sum of moves on different fronts. The new president recruited students nationally on open scholarships, searching out bright, serious students with an apparent capacity for leadership. The president, the faculty, and their growing band of allies among the students gradually but drastically modified social activities: eliminating freshman hazing, cutting down the number of dances, and, in 1933, abolishing sororities. Most important, the administration and faculty bought back control over athletics from alumni and students by shifting the support of sports from gate receipts to college subsidy, and over a period of about twelve years transformed the program of big-time sports into one of intramural and low-key intercollegiate sports for the amateur. Athletics and social life were robbed of the dynamics that ordinarily push them toward independence and dominance, and the extra-curricular was subordinated to and integrated with the life of serious study that was being moved front and center. Intellectuality became a virtue in the student culture, with much of the excitement of competitive sports transferred to the winning of academic honor.

As in the case of Morgan at Antioch, Aydelotte were very effective in building image, and as the reputation of the college spread, the academic capacity of applicants rose. That reputation increasingly contained a picture of a friendly and lively student body, and students that were independent and non-conforming as well as very bright came to place it high in their college choices. The college then became an overlay in part for such "progressive" or "experimental" colleges as Reed, Antioch, and Sarah Lawrence, while remaining for others an alternative chiefly to Harvard, Princeton, Amherst, Oberlin. The college became a very good place to go, intellectually respectable and sufficiently desirable socially to obtain sons and daughters of top government and business leaders, without at the same time being weighed down with the problems of status and cool sophistication that has bedeviled many other leading private colleges on the eastern seaboard.

The faculty was steadily expanded from forty in 1920 to one hundred in 1940 and improved markedly in quality until it was a group that could compete effectively in scholarship with university faculties. By the time Aydelotte left in 1940, four-fifths of the faculty had been recruited during his tenure. This faculty was dedicated to the Honors Program and the components of the campus that interlocked around it. For them, by 1940, to say Swarthmore was to say Honors Program. And this faculty too, as at Antioch and Reed, came to possess much authority, and the authority they have possessed has been used to conserve the change. The authority resides partly in the department and partly in a sense-of-the-meeting relation of faculty and administration in which some men of the faculty are more sensed than others.

Swarthmore, like Reed, has features that we would ordinarily associate with graduate schools. The honors students are completely in seminars and self-study for two years. The faculty has favored concentration over sampling, and there is much specialization in major fields. The honors students face written and oral examinations on extensive materials at the end of their senior year. These examinations are given by outside examiners and are often at the level of master's degree work in institutions where the students are not so bright. The modern trend of undergraduates proceeding to graduate school is very strong at such a college. Along with so many other small colleges, Swarthmore faces the problem of what it means to be a liberal arts college in the new age where an unusually able group of students prepare themselves along specialized lines for graduate study.

Components of the Organizational Character of Colleges

These cases exhibit a number of features important to the character of a college: curricular patterns, faculty values, the distribution of authority, public images, student traditions. There is no definitive way to sort such features; we cannot predict that certain features are everywhere important; and we must be careful in reasoning from small colleges to large universities. But the features can be listed and grouped as sensitizing ideas to form a diagnostic battery from which we may draw leads in other cases. As we build up the catalog over time, we become more sensitive to the possibilities of any given case.

I will review these features of college organization under three headings: the institutional; the faculty; and the students.

Institutional Features

The Curriculum. It has become fashionable in research on colleges to ignore the curriculum. But the curriculum is a structure of work assignments of central personnel and tells us much about basic commitments. We can quickly learn, for example, whether a liberal arts college is devoted to the traditional disciplines of the liberal arts or to job training, by identifying its variety of courses and majors and the numbers of faculty and students in the different fields. If a college has distinctive educational ideals, we will find them embodied in some form in the curriculum. In the case of Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore, parts of the curriculum constitute a prime element of character. At Antioch, the work-study curriculum is a central commitment, a hallowed part of the institutional self. At Reed, a particular array of mandatory courses and other requirements for graduation concretely expresses academic toughness in the pure liberal arts. At Swarthmore, Honors is the defining element and symbol. Colleges of less distinct character will have less distinct curricular features, but everywhere the curriculum reflects some of what the institution is committed to doing. The official program is thus an easy place to begin character analysis; perhaps nothing else lies so much on the surface and is so available to the first glance.

Traditional Self-Image. A college is more than a sum of its individual members because, among other reasons, it has a history, and a host of ways, including shared memories, of reflecting that past in the present. For reasons only partly clear (competitive position in the market is one such reason), colleges are prone to a remembrance of things past and a self-image as unlike-all-others. The more distinctive the history, the stronger the memory and the self-image. Antioch is an excellent example. Memory of a heroic age, the 1920's and 1930's, has been carried in the self-identity and mutual identification of senior faculty and administrators. For them, the word Antioch sets up vibrations of the intensity that many Harvard men associate with the word Harvard. It is Morgan, and Community Government, and not firing anyone in the Depression, and paying off the mortgage, and the fire in the Science Building, and folk dancing in Red Square, and Personnel Counselors, and always the ceaseless exchange of on-campus and off-campus students in the Coop Program. There is so much that is symbolic of the meaning and potency of living one's years at the college and of the college's years in society. In colleges where there is less to symbolize, some kind of unified self-image is still likely to obtain, a slimmed-down version of the past that we might call a memory culture. There are no definite areas of campus life where the core of this culture has to manifest itself. It is often expressed in the themes of the catalogs and commencements, the repetitive cries of students and faculty about the decline of what the college has always stood for, and the issues raised by Young Turks that bring the senior faculty out of their seats.

Authority Structure. The distribution of authority on a campus is so often a critical component because it helps determine what values will be strongly supported and expressed. Different interest groups within the college attempt to further different programs, to serve different constituencies, and to maintain or change traditional self-images. The capacity of the different factions to further group desires is a function of differential authority. The different desires may sometimes be readily identified by opinion surveys and interviews, but the differential capacity to implement desire is often sufficiently complex and hidden that much on-campus investigation and historical study is required.

Campuses are bewildering governments because trustee authority, administrative authority, faculty authority, and sometimes student authority, are legitimate principles of authority and are operatively in serious contention. Formally the campus may approach a dual or triple government. With authority much subdivided by sub-college, division, department, and administrative office, the large campus also formally has features of a federation. The diffusion of formal authority in turn demands much unofficial or informal behavior on the part of field officers trying to fulfill their own responsibilities as well as by central officials trying to co-ordinate the whole. The modern university more than any other modern organization perhaps presses important actors toward unofficial interaction, adaptation, and accommodation. We should assume that many of these actors are following the dictum: "there's always a way around the rule—find it." One specific way to study the dynamics of change, then, is to identify some successful campus leaders and find out how they unofficially have worked their way through ambiguity or around rules to institute a change that is later ratified as part of the formal structure. This kind of research is perhaps a search for the latent pilot project.

Social Base. There are certain features of the character of colleges that are often overlooked because they reside off campus. Public image is ordinarily very important, yet it is rarely discussed. The impressions of the college held by outsiders mediate the college's relations with its environment and affect its viability. The social bases or constituencies of the college are also important, for resources must be drawn from the environment and resource-granting groups must be constructed and institutionalized if the organization is to achieve some security. With their turnover of clientele (students), colleges seek constituencies that will guarantee a steady flow of students. Financial supporters, of course, are also sought. These external linkages may actually free a college, making it quite autonomous; or they may entail dependencies that determine policy and practice.

To ascertain what a college can and cannot do, therefore, we must usually identify these in-the-environment components of character—how the college is regarded and by whom, the social strata from which students flow, and the nature of the relation to financial donors and host agencies. The important external relations also increasingly include a connection to the federal government. The term "federal-grant university" has recently come into use to refer to the university that receives a sizable share of its resources from the federal government. Much has been entailed in this relation: e.g., heavy support for natural science and with this a change in the balance of the curriculum and in the balance of rewards among segments of the faculty; more emphasis on research; a diversification of revenue sources that has given public universities greater freedom from constraints of local and state government; the growth of direct ties between faculty entrepreneurs and outside agencies, weakening collective controls of faculty and administration.

The Faculty

Certain aspects of the faculty have been discussed above; e.g., the linkage of faculty values to the traditional self-image of the institution; the further linkage of faculty authority to the traditional values and self-image. The different conceptions of the institution held by faculty members and the capacity to defend and sustain certain values are critical faculty components of institutional character.

We can expect certain general orientations to vary systematically among colleges, according to the class of colleges to which the institution belongs.[2] In order to perform effectively, a college needs diverse orientations in its faculty; these include teaching, administration, and research and scholarly study. Colleges vary greatly in the extent to which they reward these different orientations, and in the orientations' distribution and relative strength, with four-year colleges largely rewarding attention to the student and universities rewarding orientation to one's discipline or profession. The kind of professor idealized in the small liberal arts college may be the teacher-scholar, the teacher-counselor-friend, or just plain teacher, but in any case the norm emphasizes teaching and points to the student; in these colleges, the undergraduate is what the college is largely about. But the university is involved in many other operations, being primarily a center of research, scholarship, and professional training; close attention to the education of the individual undergraduate student is not generally a prominent part of the professor model as it is seen from within the ranks.

---

[2] From Burton R. Clark and Martin Trow, "Determinants of College Student Subcultures," in T. M. Newcomb and E. K. Wilson (eds.), The Study of College Peer Groups (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, forthcoming).

Thus faculty members' interests vary from a singleness of purpose in shaping the undergraduate student to a complex of interests in which the student plays a small part. At one extreme there is the teacher who deeply involves himself in the lives of students, seeing them frequently and informally in diverse situations and being on call at any hour for advice and support. For such locally oriented teachers, their college is a way of life for their families as well as for themselves. Here faculty interests encourage an interpenetration of faculty and student cultures. At the other extreme is the professor who teaches as little as possible and then is off to interests that separate him from students, often but not always the pursuit of research and scholarly writing. These research and scholarly interests, reflecting an orientation to the cosmopolitan world of scholarship, science and distant peers, and a career pattern of movement from college to college, tend to reduce faculty-student relations to interaction in the classroom. Cosmopolitan interests are an important source of the schism between faculty and student cultures that is a central component of the character of many state universities. In pulling the teachers away from the students, the faculty's professional interests promote the rise and persistence of an autonomous student culture which is filled in by student interests and definitions of the campus situation.

In the strain between professionalism and localism in faculty interests, between an orientation to a far-flung discipline and a commitment to the local college and student, some faculty members effect a compromise wherein they have many avenues of contact with students while sustaining a professionally rewarding career. A few such men are found in the better small colleges, and are afforded high status because they are both professionally competent and locally committed. They are also found in the large universities, where they rarely receive the highest esteem for their involvement with undergraduates. In general, however, most faculty members do not balance these interests in a rough parity, but come down heavily on the interests rewarded by the organization and promising for a career. Thus, small-college faculties tend to be strongholds of personal and particularistic relations with students; university staffs, centers of impersonal relations and universalistic criteria. The one generally produces some faculty understanding and penetration of student life; the other is based on and reinforces social distance between faculty and students.

The Students

There is nothing in other organizations that is quite like the student in the college. He is clientele, materiel, and participant, all rolled into one; and he is considerably freer than the hospital patient, the prison inmate, and the clients of most other people-processing organizations to whom he otherwise has important similarities. His characteristics are institution-defining, and in his relative freedom he maneuvers significantly in interaction with staff. Hence we need always know, at least, the students' input qualities and their campus roles and subcultures.

Input Qualities. The freshmen classes of different colleges vary immensely in their occupational aspirations, educational plans, personality characteristics (e.g., creativity, authoritarianism), and a wide range of attitudes and values, as well as in the ability and achievement that are measured by standard tests. The input qualities enter heavily into the determination of the character of the institution. A large number of entering students interested in social reform and political action will tend to produce a campus subculture of social reform and political action. A large number of boys coming to a college for job training in engineering will tend to produce a no-nonsense vocational spirit on campus.

In understanding the character of a college or university, it helps to know not only what the students' input qualities specifically are and what effect these characteristics have on student life and the tasks of faculty and administrators but also why the freshman class (and transfers) takes the shape it does. The input qualities are determined by such characteristics of the college as location, tuition, and formal selectivity; and, as mentioned earlier, by reputation—a carrying mechanism of character. Some input is accidental—by blind or unthinking choice—but most is systematically linked to what the institution already is and is thought to be. We can fully relate the freshmen class as a component of character to other components of institutional character only when we know why people with certain characteristics came and people with certain other characteristics stayed away.

Roles and Subcultures. Growing up in college, or getting through college, has many shapes. Students do it differently because of different original intention or because of styles they encounter on campus. There is much to learn on a campus about the variety of student interests, roles, and subcultures. First, we need to know the range of alternatives. Is the campus a single culture for students, or two or three, or a dozen? Some small colleges approach the monolithic extreme; some large universities approach the heterogeneity of the metropolis—name an orientation and you and find it present, from John Birch Society to Communist Party, from fundamental sect to atheism, from the most crude vocationalism to the most precious scholarship. In identifying the range of alternative cultural homes, we come to know the contents of the subcultures and something about their relative strength in numbers of students involved.

Second, we need to know whether an "orientation" is a "subculture"; that is, whether a particular sentiment is held by detached individuals who pass one another as strangers or is a set of definitions and responses shared by individuals who connect. An atomistic orientation may be held by many students but be weak in influence on campus because it does not enlist the energies of action cliques and their supporting groups. Students who commute to college for job-training do not generally underpin their orientation with group ties and interpersonal supports in the same degree as do the non-conformists who cling together in the "pad" and coffeehouse. The first group, we often say, is the passive majority; the latter group has visibility and influence "out of proportion to their numbers."

In studying student subcultures, it is often helpful to identify how the extracurricular components of the life of the student connect to the curricular components. Are the two tightly or loosely integrated; what are the terms of existence that one sets for the other; does one dominate the other; how does the administrative structure of the campus and the interests of the faculty determine the relation of the curricular and extracurricular?

The Importance of Historical Perspective

To interpret organization character from organizational behavior is difficult any way that we attempt it. Similar events or practices have different meaning in different organizations, and indeed can have different meaning in one organization at different stages of development. We find ourselves unsure whether an observed practice is a central or marginal component, a part of basic commitments or an accidental and expendable appendage. Much that we wish to know, e.g., the institutional self-image, is an intangible composite that is amorphous to the structuring eye and distant to the intimate touch. Given such apparent difficulties, how then best to proceed in appraising the character of a particular institution? One way, especially where we are interested in change, is to cultivate a historical sensitivity. An organizational analysis with historical perspective offers a number of advantages that I tried to exemplify in the case descriptions of three colleges. I will offer several guides for this style of analysis and suggest a few of the advantages.

The first directive is to search for the last character-defining era, the most recent period of major change, and identify the ideals and new practices of that time. Study of the critical era offers many possibilities of insight. One can study the specific tools of change at that stage of history and the conditions under which a major change was possible. One can study elements of later importance at a time when struggle and definition were necessary, when the elements were new and problematic and requiring deliberate effort to establish them. To study the period of transformation is usually to study certain features of present character in their most explicit and pristine form, before they became partially obscured by routines and made confusing to the eyes of the current observer by compromise and evolution. As Herbert Kaufman has observed, in a brilliant organizational study: "the members of all organizations are governed by values, beliefs, and customs that are almost indiscernible if research is confined to short periods in the evolution of the organizations. Time is a factor to be reckoned with."[3]

The second directive is to identify the carrying mechanisms, the features of organization that have the dynamic capacity to sustain not only themselves but other elements as well and have worked to preserve character from the last period of major change to the present. A common carrying mechanism is the relatively small group of senior faculty who (a) are wedded to a particular conception, (b) recruit and socialize to their point of view, and (c) have sufficient authority to ward off intruders and innovators. Such a cadre is a dynamic element in that it is a self-renew-

---

[3] Herbert Kaufman, The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1960), p. 6.

ing source of energy and commitment, often spontaneously and unconsciously working to maintain a certain set of values. Another common carrying mechanism is public reputation, fixed in patterned ways in the minds of outsiders, mediating the relation of the college to many aspects of its environment. Its dynamic role comes in its effects on the availability of new students, faculty, administrators, money, and moral support. Many structures and practices of a campus, e.g., an esteemed segment of the curriculum, have some momentum of their own, and, where interlocked with other features, are capable of carrying the past into the present and future. Many features of a campus contribute to some degree, and respective contributions are difficult to disentangle and weigh.

Having studied the last character-defining era and the mechanisms of stable trajectory, a third step is to look for the pressures of current changing environment on established character and the adaptations thereby required. We are all aware that small liberal arts colleges, in general, are facing a major test currently, as technology, specialization, and mass education come to dominate higher education. But the colleges face the test in significantly different degrees and in different specific ways according to the propensities of their own specific characters. Antioch, with its commitment to a fairly extreme version of general education, finds itself under much pressure, from new student and new faculty, to reduce its work program, cut back on the effort to make a community, and concentrate on the specialized classroom that prepares the student for graduate school. The current evolution of programs is in these directions. Reed does not face the same problems in adapting to this age of specialization. It always has been classroom-centered and specialized; its problems center on how far a commitment to research should be developed in the faculty, to compete for scarce faculty talents, and how much to venture into becoming a graduate school. These somewhat different sets of problems and responses can only be understood by knowing well what the college has traditionally stood for as well as knowing the pressures of modern times on the American liberal arts college.

In short, we gain insight on the character of a college and its propensity for change by inquiring into the last major stage of character definition, the elements that have perpetuated that character over time, and the adjustment of those elements to a changing environment. The trajectory of historic character allows us to make some prediction of what the organization would be like in the future if left alone. If we also identify current environmental pressures, we can then predict how that trajectory will be buffeted and in what direction it will probably swerve.

ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR AND FACULTY MEMBER IN THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

by

Edmund H. Volkart

Dr. Volkart examines the ways in which faculty and administrators become involved in the process of change in specific areas of university life, namely, in matters concerning personnel, organization, curriculum, and institutional goals. One of Dr. Volkart's major themes is that "quiet" changes are continually occurring. The products of these on-going changes may be more important than the process of change, for it is these outcomes of change that require further adaptive action if the university is to continue as a viable organization. Volkart's analysis of the influence of the faculty as a source of power to change conditions leads him to conclude that this power typically resides in the hands of a small minority. These persons are, in Clark's terms, the carriers of change.

Dr. Volkart is Dean of Faculty and Professor of Sociology at Oregon State University. He has taught at Syracuse University, Yale University, and Stanford University. He has held important administrative positions at Stanford University and Oregon State University. Dr. Volkart has published articles on the sociology of medicine and served as editor of the journal, Social Behavior and Personality.

Some general observations about the subject of this paper may be helpful at the outset. It is my view that the processes of change in a large, modern university are complex and subtle; that the crucial points of initiation and decision are often obscure; and that they cannot be captured fully except by conscientious and systematic observation. This is why the researches of people like Becker, Blau, and Clark are so important, not to mention all the other investigations that are now taking place. Further, the distinction between descriptions of change and interpretations of change should always be kept in mind. Educational changes of any magnitude occur in a context of often-conflicting pressures—from students, faculty, alumni, government, and yes, administrators—and they are constantly influenced by economic, legal, and ideological factors, some of which are more intangible than others, but nonetheless real. To understand the dynamics of change requires not only the precise description of events as they occur, but also an interpretation of their meaning. This is more easily said than done. Witness the recent and continuing episode at Berkeley: in a sense we know what is going on, but there are various interpretations of why.

A final general observation pertains to the title of this paper: The Administrator and the Faculty Member. It is my view that there are faculty members and there are faculty members; there are administrators, and there are administrators. There is much variation hidden beneath the deceptively simple words "faculty member" and "administrator." Some faculty members identify much more closely with the "administration" than they should, and perhaps too few administrators identify enough with the faculty. The point is that generalizations about these two categories of university personnel and about their interrelations must usually be carefully qualified else we deal in little more than stereotypes.

Against this brief background, my primary purposes are to suggest a few ideas about the nature of educational change, to describe some of the roles of faculty members and administrators in the process, and to illustrate these factors as best I can. In pursuit of these objectives it will be useful first to establish a framework of inclusion and exclusion. A major focus of this paper will be on changes within an institution of higher education, rather than changes affecting larger educational systems such as the ones studied by James Conant. Another selected emphasis will be on academic and organizational aspects of a university and not on architectural styles, faculty parking, or intercollegiate athletics, for example. By thus circumscribing the field of inquiry some oversimplification will occur because all aspects of a university are intricately interrelated. However, some compensation is gained by treating those aspects with which one is most familiar. Finally, in this frame of reference, it should be clear that non-change is just as significant to the life of an institution as is change, and that often it is as important to understand why some intended, expected, or desired change did not occur, as to understand why another did occur.

The Nature of Educational Change

All education—with the exception of that conducted by private tutors on a one-to-one basis—is carried on through organized human groups: primary schools, secondary schools, school systems, junior colleges, preparatory schools, colleges, and universities. The organization may be rather simple, as in the little red school house of another epoch, or very complex such as the school systems of large cities or the multiple campuses of the University of California. The important point is that education is carried on by means of organizations; by the same token educational change takes place in these organizations. Educational change thus shares some features of organizational change in general, at the same time having some distinctive features because educational organizations have some unique purposes and traditions, as well as a distinctive culture. Every university resembles any human organization in some respects, resembles any university in some respects, and differs from any organization or any other university in some respects.

In focusing on change within a university, I have selected some areas that seem particularly significant: personnel, organization, curriculum, and institutional goals.

Personnel

Changes in personnel, among either the faculty or the administration, are among the most decisive changes that happen in a university. One type can be called "change by replacement." Each year, in any institution, some staff members will leave voluntarily or involuntarily. The reasons for leaving, at this point, are not as important as is the fact that the departing staff members must be replaced. Most of these replacements are rather routine in that the department usually seeks a new staff member who is similar in training and rank to the departing member. But the introduction of a new face, a new mind, into an existing situation can also have consequences: there are shifts in patterns of interpersonal relations both within and without the department, and even if the newcomer teaches the same-named courses as the departed staff member, he will provide some new perspectives in content and emphasis.

There is also change through addition. In recent decades, as enrollments have increased or the functions of a university have expanded, provision is made for new staff: additions rather than replacement. Here again this type of change has a somewhat dispersed effect, showing up in certain departments or schools, but not immediately visible in the total institution. Yet, if enough additions are made over a given period of time, there can be a very significant impact on the institution. For one thing, the ratio between the old and the new staff members is modified and the voices of the newcomers will be heard more frequently in faculty committees and in the faculty senate or similar body. It would be very instructive, I think, to compare different colleges and universities in terms of this ratio, whatever the cutting points would be. The number of faculty additions can also be important in another way, for increase in size usually brings about additions to administrative staff—although my observations seem to indicate something of a lag in this respect.

Combinations of change by replacement and change by addition can also prove very effective if the administration of an institution has clear ideas about its goals. Some departments can be selected for "beefing up" and resources can be channeled to them on the condition that recruiting practices change. The entire image, locally and nationally, of an average-sized department can be changed in a few years by adroit replacement of department staff and the addition of some newcomers.

Faculty changes, then, are very important elements of the total process of change in the modern university. In major universities, at least, much time and attention is devoted to the problem of recruitment. Departments will usually conduct intensive searches for the highest qualified persons; department committees will seek much information about prospective candidates, including not only professional training and experience, but also personality characteristics and family stability. The weight assigned to these various dimensions will vary, of course, from department to department, but my general impression is that productivity, or the potential of being a productive scholar or scientist, is emerging as the central criterion of selection. Under conditions of modern competition for talent most universities prefer that their departments enjoy a favorable national reputation rather than simply being happy departments. Indeed, this preference is a corollary to the university's drive for specialization, graduate emphasis in education, and research productivity—at more than a little expense to undergraduate programs.

Significant as they may be, faculty changes usually do not receive as much attention as changes in administration. When it is necessary to replace department chairmen, deans, or the president of a university, the process often becomes not only more complicated but also more heated. This is understandable because each of these positions carries with it considerable authority and voice in the affairs of the university.

In the case of a department head or chairman, one old conflict arises immediately: is the replacement to be selected by members of the department, appointed by the administration, or some combination of these? Is he to be regarded as a tool of the administration, or as the representative of and spokesman for the faculty in administrative matters? Whatever the process of selection may be, it is my impression that department members have acquired a larger voice in naming their immediate administrative officer—or at least that most administrations do not make such an appointment without consulting departmental representatives.

The selection of a dean or a president, of course, is a much more complicated enterprise, primarily because many more persons and units of the university are affected by the choice. Other administrative officers are concerned about the appointment and how the candidates for the position will or will not fit into existing policies and procedures. Faculty members are concerned about whether the new dean or president will be sympathetic to their points of view, the extent to which he is democratic or autocratic, and whether he favors or opposes their view on local or professional issues. It is well understood by all concerned that while these offices do possess inherent power and authority, it will be the personality and administrative style of the incumbent which will mediate the exercise of authority. Because of these considerations, prospective candidates are usually screened very thoroughly by faculty committees, personal visits and interviews, and administrative review.

One of the central issues in filling key administrative posts in a modern university is promotion from within the ranks as opposed to bringing in someone from outside. Within many institutions of higher learning it is widely held that local staff members should be rewarded for faithful and outstanding service by promotion to vacancies as department heads or other administrative positions. This is not an unreasonable position. Such persons have proven themselves in terms of local criteria, they are experienced in the ways of the institution, and they often can claim the respect and support of their colleagues. They should, therefore, be able to administer well and successfully.

Yet the promotion-from-within doctrine has its liabilities as well as its assets. The very experience which makes the local staff member valuable in one sense, detracts from that value in another sense: he is more likely to accept the local culture as it is; he finds it comfortable and rewarding, and hence he is not likely to perceive areas of needed change or to be active in promoting change. Moreover, to ascend through the ranks has other drawbacks. If a faculty member is appointed to a major administrative position he undergoes a considerable change in role, leaving the in-group of the faculty and joining the former out-group of the administration. After some years of identity with the faculty, he now must assume an identity with the administration, and the perspectives and responsibilities can be quite different. This is not to say that such a transition cannot be gracefully accomplished by some persons, but merely to point out that it may impose difficulties on many, with some accompanying impairment of administrative effectiveness.

In general, it is my impression that more promotions from within occur in institutions that are generally satisfied, or even complacent, about their status or ambition. Institutions that are "on the make" tend more often to draw upon outside talent—and if this involves the transition from faculty member to administrator it is probably attained more easily in a new environment than in the old one.

In any event, changes in personnel among faculty and administration are among the most important changes that can occur in an educational institution. If the right person or persons occupy the right position or positions at the right time, the university or college can flourish beyond all expectations—and in spite of its traditions, its structure, or its procedures. In a very real sense, I think, the character of an institution of higher education is determined more by the staff it seeks, attracts, and retains, than by any other single factor.

Organization

How best to organize a university—particularly the large, complex institution of our time—is a question that probably will never be answered to the satisfaction of everyone. That education requires organization—in the sense of institutional rules, commonly understood procedures, and a hierarchy of decision-making—is clear enough. It is equally clear that organizational problems will simply become more acute as institutions increase in size and attempt to absorb the highly specialized fields of knowledge that are emerging. To effect organizational changes in universities then is usually a rather complex matter. But this depends primarily upon the existing base-line of organization and the extent to which this includes procedures for bringing about change, or preventing it. Here I should like to explore, somewhat briefly, some different types of situations that might be encountered.

In a number of educational institutions there has been a long tradition of strong administrators. Department chairmen and deans have held their positions for fairly long periods of time, and tend to regard most of the affairs of the university or college as their private bailiwick. While there may be faculty committees and a faculty senate or similar body, their functions are confined primarily to making studies and recommendations, and perhaps ratifying decisions that have been made by administrators. These conditions arise in a number of ways: often the administrators tend to be the more aggressive persons, and faculty members, absorbed in their own academic pursuits, don't care to be bothered by the problems of governance. In any event, administrative control is well established and all seems well, at least on the surface.

Yet, on any campus one will usually find some group of dissidents, a number of faculty members who chafe under administrative rule, and who claim broader rights for the faculty. They see the faculty as policy-makers, as persons who should have larger and louder voices in conducting the affairs of the university or college. In the absence of strong support from other faculty members, this group will either leave to find greener pastures or will continue to play primarily a complaining role. On the other hand, if a new president, or a new dean, arrives who is committed to some sort of democratic ethic, or one who believes the faculty should play an important role, the possibilities of organizational change are greatly enhanced.

The faculty may be encouraged to initiate new proposals and programs, rather than merely reacting to ideas from elsewhere; more policy matters can be referred to faculty committees or brought to open discussion at the faculty senate; when administrative appointments must be made, the faculty can be consulted in systematic fashion; faculty participation in decisions regarding promotion and tenure can be increased. In a variety of ways, faculty members can be encouraged to regard themselves as more than mere employees, as persons whose judgment and opinions are sought and respected. To many faculty members, these opportunities to participate more fully in the total academic community will be welcomed, and the institution will usually benefit from these new-found resources. Other faculty members will undoubtedly have to be persuaded that their obligations and responsibilities to the institution extend beyond the areas of teaching and research.

Such changes are not achieved without some costs. One of the most important costs is time. Faculty government, or an enhanced faculty role in institutional management, requires much time on the part of the faculty. Hours spent in committee meetings, writing reports, or studying the complex issues of curriculum or admissions, cannot be spent in professional reading, research, publication, leisure time, or even teaching. And it is not uncommon for some faculty members, who sincerely believe in faculty participation, to conclude that it is simply too expensive, and "what do we hire administrators for anyway?" Another cost is found in the errors and mistakes made by faculty members who come late to the problems of policy. In their new-found freedoms, faculty members and their committees may become over-zealous and devise policies and procedures that are too sweeping or impossible to carry out because of the cumbersome machinery invoked. Not infrequently, when these changes occur, a campus can become so committee-ridden that decisions are never reached and the institution loses momentum. Certainly a major problem is the difficulty of defining where academic policies end and administrative jurisdiction begins. The fact is that a faculty seeking to broaden its responsibilities after years of close administrative control must go through a period of political socialization, and this period can be stormy indeed for all concerned.

Another type of situation would be exactly the reverse of the one sketched above. Here there would be a long tradition of faculty governance, perhaps at the expense of administrative leadership. The deans and department heads may be on a rotating basis, so that authority does not become frozen into either a position or a person. In extreme cases, administrative tenure may depend upon how popular the administrator remains in faculty judgment, which can lead to lack of decisiveness and a weakening of the departments thus organized. In any event, the intent of this type of system is to strip administrators of any genuine decision-making capacity, to confine their role to rather routine, clerical operations, and to retain faculty power, diffuse and inefficient as this may be.

This type of organization, too, is not without its limitations. Intensive and extensive faculty consideration of a wide variety of issues often results in endless debate but little action. There is also some tendency for key positions (committee chairmanships, executive secretaries, etc.) to fall into the hands of older faculty workhorses who use their positions to delay change as much as possible. Matters requiring attention can be studied and restudied, or passed from committee to committee, in a tortuous process of analysis, review, and consideration. It is my impression that in institutions where this kind of faculty government exists, there may be less democracy than there appears to be: real power lies in the hands of those faculty members who enjoy campus politics and who work at it assiduously year in and year out. Their political sophistication usually permits them to control committee appointments, the agenda of meetings, and even planning in advance who will make what motions, and who will speak to what points.

Where conditions of administrative control and domination exist, it is unquestionably better for the institution to foster broader faculty participation in the decision-making process. Where conditions of faculty governance and domination exist, it is unquestionably better to examine the situation and see if more administrative leadership would not result in increased efficiency, without, at the same time, diminishing the strong and proper role of the faculty. But any organizational change, involving faculty-administration relations is bound to create new problems in its wake. A few illustrations may be helpful to round out this section.

In one college of a particular university, relationships between faculty members and department heads had been very comfortable for a number of years. This stemmed from the fact that they were all united in a common purpose, namely, to obtain new curricular allocations and degree programs. One department head was then appointed dean. He began to hold regular meetings with the department heads and chairmen, seeking their advice and providing information on the university's policies and plans. Faculty meetings were also initiated, and soon the faculty voted that their elected representatives to the faculty senate (of the entire university) should comprise a policy committee to aid the dean. One of the first issues to which the new policy committee devoted its attention was the matter of the term of office and mode of appointment of department heads and chairmen! By a vast majority the faculty of the college approved a policy whereby every five years, department members would have an opportunity to express their judgment of their department head by secret ballot, and that evidence of extensive dissatisfaction would require further review by the dean.

Not unnaturally, many department heads and chairmen, who were initially sympathetic to the expansion of faculty rights, now found themselves "under the gun"—or at least, thought they were. Moreover, many of them believed that the new policy committee now had more direct access to the dean than did they themselves. At last report, the dean was a sadder but wiser man, reflecting somewhat wryly on the vagaries of academic life.

A second illustration is found in a reorganization of the faculty senate which went into effect some time ago on a large campus. Under the new by-laws, academic deans and other administrators were not automatically members of the senate. A number of committees and councils formerly reporting to the administrative council (composed of deans and other administrators) were made responsible to the faculty senate. The powers of the executive committee of the faculty senate were greatly expanded, in terms of committee appointments and definition of the responsibilities and functions of these bodies. So far so good. Then the problems began to arise. Jurisdictional disputes arose between the administrative council and the executive committee as to which committees make academic policy, and which ones merely administer policies. Some committees and councils felt they had lost status and prestige because, under the new arrangements, they did not have as much direct access to the president's office as they had formerly enjoyed. Moreover, the executive committee members now found that their new duties required many more hours of work and discussion each week than they had anticipated. And the cream of the jest, if such it be, is that the executive committee, which is elective and which was designed to represent faculty interests, now contains three deans, three department heads, and only one bona fide faculty member!

The first two sections of this paper have been concerned with the personnel and the organization of a university, and patterns of change related to them. Yet there is a certain artificiality in thus separating personnel from organization; they are intricately interrelated. The location of the various personnel (here, primarily, faculty members and administrators) in the structure of the university is partially determined by the form of organization that exists; and the organization operates day by day through the kind of personnel that inhabit the positions of the organization. This is important to recognize because the results of change in either of these two categories on the other are more significant than the process of change itself: they become the new conditions of internal tension which will require even further adaptive action if the university is to continue as a viable institution.

It is noteworthy that universities do manage to remain going concerns despite all the attempted and achieved changes taking place. Somehow, in the midst of changing faculty factions and the perennial conflicts between faculty and administration, the business of education and research goes on. The only interpretation I can offer for this state of affairs is found in an old sociological concept that probably applies to all organizations, and not universities alone—"antagonistic co-operation." Among the various horizontal and vertical units that comprise a university, an uneasy homeostasis exists, and even though antagonisms are frequent, there remains enough co-operation to get the job done.

Curriculum

One of the most distinctive features of any educational institution, as compared to other types of institutions, is something called a "curriculum." This word is derived from Latin, where it meant a course or a race, or something that one runs. Now it has come to mean not a race track (though some similarities still remain, I think) but a course of study or the educational offerings of a school, college, or university. Curriculum development, revision, and change is one of the great battlegrounds of contemporary higher education, and few wars are entered upon with such zest and fervor as characterize contending faculty members working on a curriculum.

At any given time the curriculum of a university will reflect the outcome of many different forces. For one thing, it will, to some extent, represent the amount of available knowledge—not completely, of course, because no curriculum can contain *all* knowledge, and also because it takes some time for the newer knowledge to be incorporated into course offerings. Nevertheless, as specialized and highly technical research gives rise to new knowledge, there is a strong tendency for curricula to also become fragmented and specialized.

A curriculum will also reflect the selective emphasis of the particular faculty assembled at a particular university. Since all the subject matter of any discipline cannot be covered, the offerings in each field will represent the special training and interests of faculty members. To be sure, there are some commonalities in curricula from one campus to another, else higher education would be completely idiosyncratic, but there are distinctive emphases also. The sociology curriculum at Stanford University, for example, is markedly different from that at the University of California in Berkeley, and many other similar contrasts could be noted. Not infrequently it is the opportunity to develop distinctive courses and interests which will attract faculty members to particular institutions.

Still another factor that helps to determine a curriculum is the relative emphasis the university places on graduate versus undergraduate education, or, in more special terms, between research and teaching. Where more emphasis is placed on graduate training, with its attendant focus on research, there is some tendency toward a curriculum of specialized courses, even at the undergraduate level.

Changes in curricula have always been occurring in various ways and in different orders of magnitude. While it is true that some professors use the lecture notes for years, or even decades, I do not believe this to be typical of the profession. Faculty members in general do continue their studies. In more or less systematic fashion they do scholarly or scientific research, and they do obtain new facts or ideas which are then incorporated into their courses. The titles of courses may remain unchanged, but what is actually taught can change greatly in approach, emphasis, or interpretation. These quiet, more or less invisible, changes may actually be more significant to higher education than other more spectacular curricular reforms.

Another type of change results from departmental action. All members of a given department, or perhaps a departmental committee, will review the course offerings with an eye to modification and improvement. Some courses may be abandoned, others consolidated into fewer hours, and new courses may be added to fill existing gaps. It is a healthy sign when departments continuously review their curricula and attempt to fit particular courses into a planned educational pattern.

Sometimes, an entire school college will embark on an intensive self-study, usually at administrative urging. If this is done conscientiously the result is little less than major curriculum reform on a broad scale. Currently, schools of medicine, home economics, and education are among those in need of such reform and many of them are so engaged. In medicine, for example, the traditional and necessary emphasis on the biological sciences should now be supplemented by the social and behavioral sciences. Home economics could probably benefit from less emphasis on skills, and more on the study of social values. And many schools of education are shifting from a focus on methods to subject-matter areas. All of these require concerted effort and study on the part of the total faculties involved, and not merely some departments.

Another significant mode of curricular change is found in the emergence of new fields of knowledge. In recent years, some of the most spectacular advances have been in the biological sciences, as quantitative techniques have given rise to such fields as modern genetics, biochemistry, and biophysics. These new approaches cut across existing departmental offerings and clamor for recognition in the curriculum—and as often as not meet stout resistance from traditionalists. Nevertheless, their importance is recognized enough to lead to new courses and also, in time, to new departmental alignments. In other words, curricular change in fundamental subjects can lead to reorganization of departmental structures or the addition of new departments.

The preceding types of curricular change come primarily from within the university itself as faculty members and administrators attempt to keep abreast of changing times. In recent years, however, in some fields the impetus for change has come from external sources, particularly professional societies or associations that attempt to set curricular standards. The American Chemical Society, for example, has probably been the single most important influence on the curriculum of chemistry majors, and the same is true in engineering through the efforts of the Engineers' Council for Professional Development and the American Society for Engineering Education. Similar reforms in the curricula of mathematics and the biological and physical sciences have been achieved by the efforts of leaders in these fields working through professional societies and with the support of agencies like the National Science Foundation. Another form of outside influence on institutional curricula is found in education, wherein state departments of education may inaugurate new criteria for teacher certification, thus forcing schools of education to modify their curricula accordingly.

To many administrators and faculty members these external pressures appear to be an unwarranted meddling in academic affairs. While this is understandable these efforts often become necessary because of the failure of faculties and administrations to discharge properly their educational responsibilities in the area of curriculum. In many universities the power structure is dominated by older faculty members who have tenure and who may also be in a position to grant or withhold tenure to younger, more dynamic faculty members. Sometimes the tenure faculty may have sacrificed their professional competence for the lure of academic politics, and they can use their political advantages and committee memberships to resist the challenges of the Young Turks who seek curricular changes more in keeping with their more recent training. It is not necessary to argue that the old-timers are always wrong, and the Young Turks are always right: the point is that inertia is too often found in the faculties and administrations of our universities, and that gadflies from either internal or external positions should be welcome.

Thus far I have suggested some of the ways in which curricular change occurs, but there is another aspect to be considered, namely, *curriculum control*. In the smaller liberal arts colleges faculty members are relatively free to teach such courses as they think proper; but in larger, more complex institutions other problems arise that often require (or seem to require) controls. For example, courses in statistics may be offered in the school of business, in various social science departments, as well as in statistics or mathematics departments. Are all these courses necessary, or do they represent unwise duplication? Similarly, various courses in schools of home economics, or education, or arts and sciences may seem to overlap a great deal, especially in broad social science areas. In any event, many universities have found it necessary to establish a curriculum committee with the function of reviewing all curricular requests so as to maintain some institutional control over curriculum developments. Such committees may question everything from the content of a proposed new course, to course prerequisites, or the level of the course, and in some places the committee can be so despotic as to infuriate faculty members or department heads who have to deal with it. It is easy to see how such committees can use their power to resist change—and it is usually the case that they define their role more as a watchdog than as a stimulator to reform.

Curriculum control, worthy as it may seem, is not without its drawbacks. One could argue that if each department or school on a campus were left unhindered to develop its own curriculum at least as good an education could be acquired as when these decisions are centralized. One may also wonder if the vast machinery involved in curriculum control is worth the effort. In some universities, for example, the process is extremely complex: curricular requests originate with departments and then are screened by a school curriculum committee; thereafter, the school forwards the curricular proposals to a committee representing the entire institution; all proposals passed by this group must then go to the faculty senate for approval, and thence to the executive office. Since some universities are also part of a state system of higher education, the proposals then travel to the chancellor's office and, if some policy issues are involved, even to the lay board of higher education. When one contemplates such a tortuous procedure it is easy to conclude that organizational needs can well frustrate educational effectiveness and efficiency. Perhaps some overlapping and duplication of courses is not a high price to pay for greater autonomy at the grass roots of education.

In any event, curricula—or the ways in which knowledge is compartmentalized and presented to students—are the primary concerns of any university. Changes of curriculum are both necessary and desirable, if higher education is to accomplish its mission. Today more than ever this is true. New knowledge is appearing much more rapidly than it can be processed. Students entering college are, in general, much better prepared than ever before. Drastic overhaul of curricula seems necessary if succeeding generations are to cope with problems of social change, increased leisure time, a highly specialized occupational structure, and the constant shrinking of the world. It is my general impression that this is not being done. Outmoded ideas of the educated man persist, and too many professional schools seek only technical competence in their products. To the extent that our curricula fail to reflect modern realities, they fail to stimulate students. May it not be that this is one of the reasons for contemporary student restlessness and an unconscionably high drop-out rate?

Institutional Goals

At first sight, it might seem that questions relating to institutional goals have no place in this discussion. Everybody knows what the objectives and aims of colleges and universities are: to educate young men and women so that they may have a satisfying and useful life in adulthood. These may be important, or even central goals of a modern university, but they are by no means exhaustive. Indeed some contemporary critics go so far as to say that these known goals are either being ignored or diminished in importance in many institutions of higher learning as their administrators and faculties pursue other goals.

Questions of institutional goals are central to any discussion of the dynamics of change in the modern university. I say this for a variety of reasons. In the first place, all the preceding topics of this paper—personnel, organization, and curriculum—are dependent upon, and conditioned by, the goals of a university, and the extent to which these goals do or do not change. If, for example, the institution has set for itself a goal of excellence in undergraduate liberal arts programs, this will affect the type of faculty members attracted to the institution, as well as the type of faculty member who is employed and retained. A quite different type of faculty and curriculum will be found in institutions which have set a goal of graduate or professional education, or a particular emphasis upon research.

In the second place, the very concept of goals usually implies change. By definition, goals are something to be pursued or attained; they speak more of the future than of the past or present. Of course, it is possible for a college or university to decide that it wishes to continue doing in the future precisely what it is doing now, and in the same way, but this viewpoint is not usually found. Most institutions at least want to improve what they are doing, even if major changes in goals are not sought; but even more frequently institutions seek new goals and abandon some that may have outlived their usefulness.

The respective roles of faculty and administration in these matters can be illustrated with several examples. Some years ago at a private university, a decision was made by the top administration that a major goal would be the development of a graduate school. Previously known primarily for its undergraduate college, the institution would not knowingly slight its undergraduate programs, but the push would be on graduate expansion. So far as I know the faculty was not consulted in any systematic fashion regarding this new goal, nor was it made an item of public information. Nevertheless, a number of consequences ensued, particularly in the distribution of budgets, in the type of faculty sought, and the type of facilities that were given highest priority. Several departments which were not research oriented and which seemed to have no particular future under the new plans were disbanded. Over a period of years, the decision and its consequences were plain to see, and they have, in general, been very favorable to the stature and reputation of the institution concerned. During the process, however, there was considerable faculty displeasure as the criteria for promotion and tenure became more rigorous, and good teaching alone was no longer sufficient.

In another university, which has a rather long tradition of emphasizing research and scholarship, it was the faculty that took the lead in sloughing off some older goals. In this case an entire school was involved. When, rather inadvertently, a faculty meeting was devoted to the program of this particular school, the assembled scholars and scientists were aghast at what they learned. Very trivial interests were paraded as great achievements, and the acquisition of minor skills by students was regarded as a major goal of the school. The general faculty felt that the resources used to support the school could be put to much better use in other segments of the university; over a period of only a few years, with administrative assistance, the entire school was disbanded. This action caused much anguish and hardship, especially on the part of the faculty members most directly affected, but the broader faculty pressures were too strong for the administration to resist, and some hard decisions were made and adhered to.

The fact is that any change in institutional goals today requires some hard decisions, unless the university is simply going to drift at the mercy of the latest pressure. History has bequeathed to the modern university an impressive number of objectives: the maintenance and transmission of our cultural heritage, general education, teacher preparation, professional education of various kinds ranging from law and medicine to forestry and pharmacy, expansion of knowledge through research, and graduate and post-graduate education. It is likely that any single university cannot perform all of these functions equally well, and some deliberate choices must be made among them. But this is not easy because different segments of the faculty have attached themselves to one or more of these goals and none of them wish to see legitimate purposes lost, even for some greater gain. This is further complicated if the administration, because of limited resources, must make such decisions involving a faculty which has tenure. One can scarcely expect any faculty to recommend its own demise. The alternative is to make the hard decision and then to phase out the operations on some sort of schedule so the least amount of personal damage ensues.

But in addition to the historical goals of the university, there are many new goals now available. The modern university is the largest reservoir of brains, talent, and knowledge ever assembled. When rapid and widespread social change creates new problems begging for solution, there is an understandable tendency to turn to the university and its human and other resources for help. Fresh demands on the university come from all sides: international education and technical assistance to under-developed nations; adult education and continuing education; special programs for mature women who either did not obtain a degree when younger, or who seek new education or occupational opportunities; vocational education of various kinds and retraining in areas not heretofore regarded as a primary mission of higher education; special courses or programs requested by governments or industry ranging from X-ray technology to the training of counselors for culturally deprived children or drop-outs; a variety of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. The list of possible new goals and programs seems endless.

Many universities have responded to these new opportunities not in terms of long-range considerations but in terms of faculty or administrative preference. Academic life today is highly competitive; faculty members and administrators alike seek various ways to demonstrate their prowess, intellectual or otherwise, and to enhance their reputation either for local gain or prized offers elsewhere. Thus when a new program is announced, with dollar signs attached, administrators and faculty view this as a new opportunity to demonstrate their ability to draw outside support. Whether [illegible]ogram in question is congruent with the central goals of the institution is not so important a consideration as getting the grant. Indeed, some universities, knowingly or unknowingly, encourage such actions by including on annual reports of service a category such as "Evidence of Professional Stature," or "Special Programs or Grants." Unless the administration has some set of goals or plans against which each of the many new programs can be measured, the personal motives of faculty members and administrators rule the day and the university soon finds itself committed to a wide array of activities which may have little or nothing to do with avowed intentions. It may be that the steady accumulation of grants, projects, institutes, and other programs enhances the status of the institution, paving the way for even more grants in the future, but in the very process its own character and identity may change without anyone really being aware of what is happening.

These realities are significant elements in attempting to understand the dynamics of change in the modern university. Like other human institutions, the university must attempt to adapt to changing circumstances, and the pace is swift and ruthless. Change is inevitable. The central question is simply whether the university can control its own rate and direction of change through rational planning, or whether it will simply be responsive on an ad hoc basis to the countless temptations placed before it. By and large, those institutions which are financially strong and which can control their enrollments are in a better position to control their own destiny than are those institutions which are vulnerable to the whims and fancies of legislators. The latter institutions are much more likely to succumb to any opportunity that will aid their already strained resources, but in the process they may also sacrifice their own autonomy and integrity.

Conclusion

The modern university is a large, complex organization, evolving rapidly and with few historical truths to guide it. Except for name it bears little resemblance to the traditional universities of Europe, England, or even nineteenth-century America. On the surface at least, the modern university resembles the culture which has given rise to it:

large, sprawling, amorphous, purposeless, materialistic. It has also, in large measure, been penetrated by a business ethic, previously unknown. Faculty members become entrepreneurs, and the relations between administrators and faculty members often seem similar to those that characterize labor and management. Profits and losses are measured by the administrator in terms of size of enrollment and increases or decreases in budgets, and by the faculty members in terms of size and numbers of grants. After all, administrators and faculty members are only human too, and like other persons of our time they are swept up in the forces of change that often are beyond their comprehension and control. They react in terms that are familiar within the culture, primarily economic.

It will be noted that in the previous paragraph, the words "on the surface" were used. They were used deliberately. Because beneath the surface of the modern university, are all the faculty members quietly going about their work, conducting their classes and performing feats of research and public service that continually astound us. Scholarship thrives, students learn, science flourishes. In the midst of unparalleled complexity, the modern academic man has entered the elite of society. It is his heritage, and his responsibility, to manage the processes of change with foresight, vision, and courage.

STUDENT CULTURE AS AN ELEMENT IN THE PROCESS OF UNIVERSITY CHANGE

by

Howard S. Becker

Becker examines the role of the student in the process of change in the university. He does so with the conceptual device of "the student culture"—or the "perspectives students develop on their problems as students." The perspectives specify the goals to be attained and the action to be taken in pursuit of the goals. Becker describes the perspectives students have developed for coping with problems that arise in relation to academic effort, making friends, and organizational activities. Becker believes that if "efforts to change student behavior do not take account of student perspectives," student culture may act as a delayer and inhibitor of changes desired by the faculty and administration.

Howard S. Becker is currently on the faculty of Northwestern University. In the past he has served as an instructor in sociology at the University of Chicago, a post-doctoral research fellow at the University of Illinois, a staff member of Community Studies, Inc., of Kansas City and the Institute for the Study of Human Problems at Stanford University. He is the author of The Other Side: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance (1964), and co-author of Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School (1961).

In seeking to understand the behavior of college students, social scientists increasingly refer to "student culbure."[1] They discover student culture through the use of a variety of research techniques and give meaning to the expression in the context of a variety of sociological, anthropological, and psychological theories. Student culture does not mean the same thing to everyone who uses the expression; indeed, the current agreement that "student culture" is an important variable masks a great deal of disagreement about the character of that variable and the way it is to be discovered empirically.[2]

When we speak of student culture, we refer to a set of understandings shared by students and a set of actions congruent with those understandings. Student culture, from this point of view, is a shared way of looking at one's world and acting in it. To use other words, it is a set of perspectives on one's situation. This, of course, is one of the possible meanings of culture. In adding the qualifying adjective student to culture, we mean to indicate that the understandings and actions grow up around the student's role as a student—they are specific to the student role. By focusing on the student role we imply that other roles students have in other areas of their lives are not of major importance to their activities as students. That is, we do not expect that the latent identities or roles of students—such roles as members of a particular social class, for instance—will have as much to do with student behavior as will identities immediately and directly associated with being a student.

We may begin with a few basic propositions about student culture so conceived. First, student culture can be viewed as a collective response to chronic and pressing problems, problems which arise when the long-range perspectives of students are confronted by the social environment of the campus. Long-range perspectives are the perspectives which bring a student to the school and tell him what kind of a place it is, what he wants out of life, and how he will get it by going to this school. They look far ahead, to the future beyond school; in looking so far, they do not encompass much of the foreground. The immediate details of school are not taken into account in a long-range perspective. When the student attempts to implement his long-range perspective in the daily life of the school, however, he finds that the perspective's detail is insufficient to tell him what to do as problems arise. He and his fellows, who share similar problems, devise ways of meeting the problems posed by the confrontation of long-range perspective and situation; they develop solutions to the problem of what is to be done here and now in order to get what they want in the future. These can be called situational perspectives.

---

[1] The description of undergraduate student culture is based on research carried out under the auspices of Community Studies, Inc., of Kansas City, Mo., and supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. The analysis and theoretical working through of the material gathered in that study has been carried on jointly by myself and Blanche Geer of Syracuse University.

[2] See, for instance, John H. Bushnell, "Student Culture at Vassar," in Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), pp. 489-514; and Burton R. Clark and Martin Trow, "Determinants of College Student Subculture" (unpublished paper).

In speaking of student problems, I do not mean to imply that these are deep-seated personal problems. I use the term in John Dewey's sense: people have problems when they cannot complete some course of action they have undertaken, when it is unclear what they should do next, and they must formulate some new line of action.

Problems vary in the extent to which they are immediate, pressing, and unsolved. In a medical school we studied, to take one extreme, the problems of students were visible and pressing; students did not know what to study or how much to study and had to develop their course of action as they went along. There was no "campus community," for older students had little contact with freshmen. There were no perspectives and cultures containing solutions to their problems already present to be put to work in the situation, and each class had to construct its own culture for itself. Each new class faced and solved its problems collectively.

This is not the case in college, where there is intense communication between new students and their older fellows. As the new student moves into the college society he faces many problems but finds cultural guidelines to their solution ready at hand. Other students have faced these problems before him and developed perspectives to cope with them; they transmit the solutions to him. It may thus appear that there are no problems and in a sense that is true; almost as quickly as a problem occurs the solution is there to be used. Yet we can still speak of the existence of problems. If the solutions were not there the students would have problems; and thus we can speak of students' situational perspectives and student culture as solutions to student problems.

Second, as I have already implied, the solutions to situational problems which comprise student culture are collective in character. They develop in a process of interaction among people who share the same problems and have an opportunity to interact with one another in the search for the solution to their problems. This specifies another of the conditions necessary for the development of student culture. If students do not in fact have similar problems, there will be no occasion for them to develop common solutions. Each student will solve his own problems in his own way. Similarly, if students, even though they have similar problems, do not have the opportunity to interact with one another extensively and intensively, they will not be able to engage in the discussion necessary to arrive at a common solution. Each student will find his own solution and go his own way. (Such a situation might be characteristic of a commuter college or a night school.) Solutions to student problems are typically not imposed on the group from outside nor even suggested from the outside; they are developed by the group itself in the course of its interaction.

Finally, given the long-range perspective with which they enter, the situational problems they encounter, and the limits of their knowledge, the situational perspectives students develop can be said to be rational. That is, they constitute some kind of consciously developed solution to the problem at hand and have been deliberately evolved as a solution to that problem. Of course, these solutions may not appear rational from some other viewpoint or from some other time perspective. If one looks ahead twenty years and asks how the student might wish he had solved the problem as he looks back from that vantage point, it may appear that the solution he used at the time was not rational. But, in the situation as they face it, the solutions and perspectives students evolve have the quality of being oriented toward concrete immediate problems and designed for their solution.

The idea of student culture was originally developed in a study of a medical school.[3] Briefly, we found that medical students were faced with the problem of learning more than they could possibly learn in the time available to them. They developed a perspective which suggested that the thing to do was find out what the faculty required them to know (in operational terms, what was likely to be asked on the examination), whether or not they thought it likely to be useful in the practice of medicine, and learn that. In the clinical years, as the pressure of exams decreased and the pressure of having to learn enough to practice medicine increased, student perspectives focused on acquiring clinical experience and on being allowed to exercise the medical responsibility characteristic of the practicing physician. Faculty members tended to disapprove of student perspectives in both cases, unhappy when students proved to be more interested in passing tests than acquiring knowledge and when students preferred clinical experience to tested scientific knowledge and the exercise of medical responsibility to studying and academic learning.

---

[3] The study is reported in Howard S. Becker, Blanche Geer, Everett C. Hughes, and Anselm L. Strauss, Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961). An extended discussion of the concepts of perspective and student culture can be found on pp. 33-43.

Student culture—the perspectives students developed on their problems as students—had noticeable effects on the organization of the school and on the way students viewed their futures in medicine. For instance, student culture gave students an alternative view to that offered by the faculty as to how they should act in medical school. It provided the basis for deviation from faculty norms of student behavior. In addition, the perspectives of student culture influenced the way students categorized and evaluated kinds of patients, their views of the advantages and disadvantages of various kinds of internships, and their attitude toward careers in different specialties.

We next applied our ideas about student culture to a study of the undergraduates of a large state university. The university was founded about the time of the Civil War and has a distinguished history. It has long been regarded by most residents of the state and surrounding states as the best and most academically oriented of the universities in the area. Its student body now numbers about 10,000, of whom between six and seven thousand are undergraduates. It is organized much like most state universities, having a college of liberal arts, a school of business, a school of engineering, a school of fine arts, a school of journalism, and a school of education. Its students are housed in the usual variety of places: fraternities, sororities, dormitories, co-operatives, rooming houses, apartments, and scholarship halls. Students consider the fraternity-sorority system among the strongest in the nation and evidence in favor of their view is found in the fact that many of the chapters on the campus have won awards as outstanding chapters in the country. Finally, the majority of students come from the state, although 10 per cent come from out of state and several hundred from foreign countries.

Since the university is so much more complex an organization than the medical school, we might logically expect to find a more varied set of perspectives among its students than we found in the student body of the medical school—several student cultures rather than one homogeneous culture. Whether one sees one student culture or many on a campus is partly a matter of the researcher's choice. One can concentrate on those things in which students are alike or on those in which they differ. Insofar as we are concerned with the problems and perspectives directly related to the role of students, students seem to us to be very much alike. We have found it more useful to think and talk about one student culture than to think about many student cultures.

The college experience itself is, in a large sense, very much the same for all students. To take an obvious example, all students are subject to the discipline of the college's system of grades, credits, and degree requirements. In saying there is one student culture, we focus on this kind of feature of campus life, an element of the common setting against which differences must be seen. Consequently, those aspects of college life related to differences in social class background or to differences in prospective careers—aspects which might produce a variety of student subcultures—seem less important to us than those directly related to the college environment and the problems it poses.

This is not to say that students do not differ either in their backgrounds or in their futures. Rather it is to say that those differences, interesting as they are, seem to us to have somewhat less effect on the way students act and think while in school than they are popularly supposed to have.[4] There are variations in how college students look at their college experience and act while they are in college, but the variations are variations on a set of common themes, related to situational variations in the college environment. We have devoted our attention more to what is common than to what is different.

When we interviewed and observed pre-freshmen who came to the university during the summer for orientation, we discovered that their long-range perspectives were very hazy.[5] They thought of the university as a very large place and were not sure how they would manage the problems it posed. They knew, of course, that there would be courses, examinations and grades, and so they had a sense that academic achievement would be important. But just what it would mean to be a student, in what dimensions one's success or failure would be measured—these questions as yet had no answers.

---

[4] For further discussion of the relation of background variables and student culture, see Howard S. Becker and Blanche Geer, "Latent Culture: A Note on the Theory of Latent Social Roles," Administrative Science Quarterly, No. 5 (September, 1960), pp. 304-13.

As they moved through the freshman year, students sharpened their idea of the meaning of the college years. In high school everything had been "kid stuff," having no lasting consequences for one's future. But now they feel that they are embarking on their careers as adults and that what they do in college will have lasting consequences for the rest of their lives. They want to show themselves and others that they can handle themselves successfully in this more adult setting. But they still do not know the specific, concrete indices which spell success on campus. The question they must answer is: What must I do to do well while I am here?

The answers to these questions are provided for them by the organization of the campus. Students develop perspectives specifying the meaning of doing well by referring to three areas of college life. There is the familiar area of academic work—classes, courses, grades, and degrees; that of making friends—including learning to manage one's relations with members of one's own sex as well as with those of the opposite sex; and an area which is harder to give a name to but which encompasses all the things ordinarily brought together under the label of "activities"—an area in which the effort is to learn how to manage people and organizations. The campus, and most college campuses, is so organized that the three areas of academic work, making friends, and activities constitute the major foci of student interest. Students believe that if they do well in all of them they will demonstrate that they have successfully grown up and will be able to think well of themselves as well as be thought well of by others.

Students develop perspectives on their college experience in the three areas I mentioned. The perspectives specify the goals to be attained, and the actions to be taken in pursuit of the goals. In the area of academic achievement, goals are set by the faculty, who design courses, give examinations, require term papers, and eventually grade students on the work done for their courses. The faculty sets standards and rewards students who meet them with good grades and, for those who are interested, help toward graduate or professional schools and professional careers. (The goal of entering a graduate or professional school is held by only a minority of students so the ability of the faculty to give or withhold help in this area does not count for as much in a student's life as does their ability to give or withhold good grades.)

---

[5] For a description of this phase of the research, see Blanche Geer, "First Days in The Field," in Philip E. Hammond (ed.), Sociologist at Work (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964), pp. 322-44.

In short, the student perspective on what constitutes achievement in academic work is that one demonstrates one's worth as a student by getting good or at least acceptable grades. Most students, except those whose abilities are far outdistanced by the demands of university work, believe that anyone can get B's or C's if he will buckle down and do the work. If one does not at least get passing grades he is behaving irresponsibly and therefore immaturely, much as a middle-class adult who could not keep a steady job and earn sufficient money to support a family would be considered irresponsible and immature.

The beliefs and activities that make up the grade-point-average perspective often take the form of an attempt to give the teacher what one thinks he wants in order to get a good grade. Some students feel a considerable disparity between what they might want or be able to learn and what they are required to learn in order to get a good grade. Other students, however, believe that what the faculty wants them to learn must of necessity be worth learning; after all, who should know better than the faculty what is important and worth knowing? Some playful and bright students turn the requirements of the faculty into a game, trying to devise solutions to the problems posed by assignments which will both satisfy faculty demands and amuse or instruct the student simultaneously.

Faculty members are often irritated by students' emphasis on grades rather than on the real content of a course. Yet they themselves have made the grade important by giving it, by putting so much emphasis on it, and by using it as a measure of student worth in other connections. We should also note that student emphasis on grades, though it is based in the first place on the view that the grade is in itself an expression of the student's worth and maturity, is also determined by the fact that grades constitute a major requirement for participation in other campus activities. If one does not maintain a passing grade point average he will not remain a member of the campus society for very long. Furthermore, grades are both formally and informally required for membership, and particularly office-holding, in most important campus organizations. The university itself requires a minimum grade point average of all officers of major organizations, and many of these organizations informally require much higher averages than the university minimum, on the premise that a student who cannot achieve high grades is unable to organize his time effectively and therefore would be unable to carry out the duties of the office successfully. Finally, grades affect one's social life, both directly and indirectly. Students who do not maintain a sufficiently high grade point average are not able to join fraternities and sororities, which are often supposed to have something of a monopoly on the most desirable members of the opposite sex.

One does well in the area of activities by getting and holding office in campus organizations and performing the tasks associated with office successfully, thereby learning to handle and manipulate people and organizations. Success in organizational activity is another of the signs students use to judge their own maturity. The campus, from one point of view, is made up of a vast network of organizations, each with its own set of officers. The various living groups each have a set of officers who deal with their internal government. One may be president of a fraternity, dormitory, or scholarship class, or hold many of the lesser offices available in his residential group. One may participate in and perhaps be an officer of one or more of the many departmental and subject-matter clubs and honorary fraternities. One can be involved in campus politics or in what might be called campus "philanthropic" organizations, such as the organization that runs the affairs of the Student Union. A very large proportion of students have at least one membership in some organization outside the living group they belong to, and many hold more than one membership. About one-third of the students have held, by the time they graduate, one or more offices in some campus organization. Success and achievement in activities through office-holding is something that a great many students are interested in and strive for.

Several points deserve mention in connection with campus activities. Some groups on campus are more successful than others in achieving the goals specified in the activities perspective, the perspective which says it is important to gain recognition by participation in and office-holding in campus organizations. In particular, Greek-letter organizations tend to get more than their share of the campus jobs considered most important. The reason for this does not lie, as some might suspect, in discrimination practiced by Greeks against independents. Rather, it can be explained by the fact that one can become a leader only if he starts working in organizations very early in his campus career and works his way up through the ranks, accumulating experience and seniority as he goes. The Greek-letter organizations encourage their members to participate in activities early and make informed suggestions as to which ones will prove to be most interesting and valuable. Although the achievement of top offices requires ability on the part of the student (he must be able to perform adequately in the positions he holds), individual ability is not the whole story. The top jobs are frequently parceled out in a political process involving deals between major groups on campus, and very able people may have to be passed over for the top jobs because it is not their house's turn to have a leader.

Students do not think of their offices in student organizations as "kid stuff" or child's play. They see activities as an important part of their education in which they can get experience unobtainable anywhere else, experience in running large organizations and manipulating groups of people. They may, for instance, have the experience of administering a budget of forty or fifty thousand dollars a year. They may, as officers of a living group, have the responsibility of trying to reconcile the necessity for humane treatment of an individual's problem with the organization's need for stability and the maintenance of a reputation—as, for instance, when the president of a dormitory or fraternity discovers that one of his fellows is a kleptomaniac or alcoholic. They may find themselves in open conflict with university personnel over major items of university policy.[6] Students feel that their experience in student organizations gives them excellent training in handling responsibility, dealing with ethical dilemmas, and in general meeting problems they will face as adults. (One observer of American industry notes that the most successful industrial executives have had the experience of being campus "big wheels," suggesting that the students' perspective is accurate.)[7]

---

[6] For a lengthy account of one earlier conflict between students and administrators over university policy, see David Horowitz, Student (New York: Ballantine Books, 1962). I consider more recent happenings at Berkeley below.

Behind student seriousness about the extra-curricular activities so many university administrators think of as childish is a deep student concern with autonomy. They feel that experience in activities can have the beneficial effects they hope for only if they truly have adult responsibilities, if the actions they take can have serious consequences for themselves, other students, and the university. If they do not have sufficient freedom of action to make serious mistakes, they think, they cannot have any real or worthwhile experiences of an adult nature. If a dean watches over them, correcting what he views as their mistakes, if they operate subject to arbitrary administrative discretion which can undo what they have done, then the adult experience they prize is being denied them.

A final area in which the perspectives of student culture operate is the area of sociable interaction—making friends and getting along with members of the opposite sex.[8] Students, for instance, consider it very important to be able to get along with other members of one's own sex, to have friends. The problems of making friends vary according to where one lives, how bright one is, and what subjects one is studying. Students who live in fraternities will have as ready-make friends all the other members of their fraternity, although these friendships may be somewhat superficial and they may still have to look for more intimate friends. Independent students are not provided with such a ready-made group of friends, but generally manage to find kindred souls in their living groups. One exception to this statement can be found among freshman women and, to some extent, among independent women generally. They are more apt than male students to feel that association with "inferior" girls may be dangerous to their campus aspirations and are more guarded in making close friends with other women.

Students also have perspectives which define the criteria of success and the means by which success is to be achieved in relations with the opposite sex, in dating. The question here is: Who among my fellow students will be a "good date," a person with whom I can sustain a properly adult heterosexual relationship, and how can I get my share of good dates? The answers lie in the way students rank living groups and in their conceptions of the proper way for heterosexual relationships to be established. Students share a conventional system of rating living groups and the students who belong to them. This rating is based on many things, including group achievement in activities and academic work, but also including looks and "sharpness" on a date. That is, even though groups mau be rated on other standards, good looks, sexual desirability, and dating sharpness are in general supposed by students to be related to the rating made on these other bases. For instance, students typically believe (though there are many exceptions) that the living groups rated highest by everyone—"top" fraternities and sororities—produce the best dates. The girls are thought to be the best looking, the men the sharpest on campus.

---

[7] See Melville Dalton, Men Who Manage: Fusions of Feeling and Theory in Administration (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959), pp. 163-66.

[8] I deal here only with patterns of sociable interaction, not overt sexual activity. A comprehensive study of sexual behavior patterns in college is reported by Winston Ehrmann in Premarital Dating Behavior (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1960).

This perspective affects student effort in many ways. Living groups attempt to improve their competitive position, trying to get a reputation for being more desirable. In part, they attempt to improve their position by excelling in other areas of activity we have already mentioned: organizations and academic work. A fraternity, for instance, will attempt to raise its grade point average, partly in hopes of being rated more highly on campus and thus gaining access to more desirable girls.

The three areas I have discussed and the perspectives of student culture on them account for a great deal of what students experience and do while they are in college. But how typical is the campus we studied of American colleges generally? My guess is that the problems of most college youth are much the same, but that the terms in which they can be solved and in which it appears proper to solve them vary from campus to campus. Thus, a much smaller college might lack the vast network of organizations in which one can acquire the ability to manage people and groups and thus demonstrate maturity in that area of life. Such a lack is often said to be compensated for by the more frequent and more intimate interaction between students so that what is lost in activities is gained in the area of personal relationships. It is often thought, for instance, that the problem of dating is less severe in a smaller institution because of the intimacy of personal relationships. This may be true, yet it is also possible that in the smaller college it is actually more difficult to achieve satisfactory dating relationships. This might occur if the student in the smaller college is not thrown into contact with members of the opposite sex through participation in a network of activities and organizations. Because of the lack of formal groups in which first meetings with members of the opposite sex take place, male students might never feel well enough acquainted with many of the girls on campus to ask them for a date.

In any event, until more studies of student culture on various kinds of campuses are available, we may suppose that the perspectives described here are to be found on other campuses, varying only as the larger context of student life varies. An understanding of student culture may help us to understand how students respond to the changes now going on in American universities.

Student Culture and the Changing University

The radical changes now taking place in American universities do not, by and large, arise out of anything students do or fail to do. They are the result of external events. As a result of the massive amount of research funds available, professors do less teaching; university budgets come to depend on research funds, so the pattern is not likely to be changed easily. Because of the expansion in enrollments and the simultaneous expansion of research support, the market for professors has never been better; they demand and get higher salaries and lighter teaching loads. With increasing enrollments, universities become bigger and bigger; the size of the student body strains the established institutions of campus life and the conventional means of establishing and maintaining order. Universities, threatened by the influx and spurred on by Sputnik, strive to raise standards; in practice, raising standards seems to mean increasing the amount of required reading, the number of papers, and the difficulty of examinations. But, with enlarged student bodies and professors teaching less, the size and impersonality of classes, particularly at the freshman-sophomore level, are increasing rapidly.[9]

Students do not cause these changes, but they are affected by them. The conditions of student life, to which student culture is a response, are changing as the university changes, and we may expect student culture to change accordingly. It is not easy to predict the direction of that change, for it is subject to a multitude of local influences which, in addition, vary from one time to another. Perhaps the best we can do is indicate the form student reactions to these changes might take under varying circumstances and some possible trends suggested by the analysis of recent events.

---

[9] On some of these points, see Charles V. Kidd, American Universities and Federal Research (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959); and Clark Kerr, The Idea of the University (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963).

One kind of reaction is the one we found in the medical school and in the academic area of college life; it might be called the subversion of faculty efforts by student culture. Many colleges and universities are now in the process of raising academic standards. In practice, at least one of the things this means is to assign more work than before: more reading, more papers, more problems, and experiments. When faculty members find their students can handle the increased workload, they are encouraged to attempt raising standards even more by assigning more work. At some point, the pressure of academic work reaches and then surpasses what most students can tolerate.[10] Insofar as faculty attempt to raise standards by assigning larger and larger amounts of work, to the point that it becomes almost literally impossible for students to manage their workload, we may expect student culture to become ever more solidly devoted to figuring out just what it is one must do to pass. We may expect that as the problem of getting by academically becomes more difficult, students will devote themselves collectively to finding solutions to it. And this will have the paradoxical result of bringing students to act even less as faculty would wish them to. Students will be even less concerned with real learning than they are now, because they will have even less time and effort available to devote to it and because the culture in which they participate will tell them even more strongly than it does now that it is best to figure out what is required and do that first.

Student culture need not produce results that the functionaries of the institution disapprove. But it will operate in that fashion if efforts to change student behavior do not take account of student perspectives, if there is no understanding how students are likely to interpret them and respond to them. We may take the effect of higher academic standards, as I have interpreted it, as a paradigm of the role of student culture as a delayer and inhibiter of changes desired by faculty and administration.

---

[10] See "The Freshman Blues," part I of a series on "College Pressure," in Life, No. 58 (January 8, 1965), pp. 63-73.

Some changes taking place in universities, however, will provoke student reactions that are not simply efforts to cope with increased pressure. Some of the current trends may produce, instead of what the faculty might consider to be foot-dragging subversion, true efforts at revolution. In the kind of case I want to consider now, students may come, as a result of perspectives contained in student culture, to question the established allocation of power in the university and to press for a redistribution more in line with what they conceive to be their own needs.

Remember that students prize autonomy, as one of the conditions for obtaining the adult experience they want from participation in activities. How are the circumstances in which they practice such autonomy likely to change as a result of current changes in our universities? We can indicate some of the factors that will be involved if we consider some recent events on American campuses, most importantly the student demonstrations over free speech at the Berkeley campus of the University of California.[11]

The Berkeley affair has been widely discussed in the press. But, for those not familiar with the events that took place in the last months of 1964, here is a brief summary. At the beginning of the fall semester, the Berkeley administration began to enforce a previously unenforced rule prohibiting soliciting funds or members for off-campus organizations and the organization of off-campus activities on the campus. Some students defied the rules and when, following a massive sit-in in the administration building, one student was arrested, large crowds surrounded the police car in which he was to be taken away and kept it immobilized for some thirty hours. Police were called in and a temporary truce was arranged. After two months of uneasy truce, an administration move to discipline leaders of the earlier demonstrations created the occasion for further civil disobedience. Students sat-in in the administration building and almost eight hundred of them were arrested. In the interim, the administration had made many concessions, but had refused to change on one key point: they insisted on the right to forbid the organization of illegal off-campus activities on campus. Many students felt that this would prevent them from organizing civil rights activities on campus and so continued the fight. After the mass arrest, a student strike, during which large numbers of teaching assistants refused to meet their classes, tied up the campus. After further attempts at peacemaking by the president of the university, the faculty voted overwhelmingly in favor of a resolution which met in substance the students' demands, the chancellor of the Berkeley campus resigned, and a new chancellor was appointed.

---

[11] What follows is in no sense to be taken as a complete analysis of the Berkeley incident. Specifically, I have, for the purposes of this paper, omitted any reference to the details of the development of the conflict and to the tactical considerations which influenced that development, both topics of considerable importance in understanding what went on. In addition, I have made no systematic effort to get information on either the conflict or its background in campus life and social structure; what I have to say is impressionistic, based essentially on what I could learn from the public press and from casual conversations with a few faculty members. Those interested in the conflict should consult the San Francisco Chronicle and the New York Times from September, 1963 on. The best coverage was by radio station KPFA of Berkeley, which produced lengthy nightly documentaries; summary tapes and LP's are available from KPFA. A number of articles have appeared already and more will no doubt follow. See, for example, S. M. Lipset, The Reporter, January 28, 1965; Paul Goodman in The New York Review of Books, January 14, 1965; Nathan Glazer, Commentary, February, 1965; and the reply to Glazer by Philip Selznick, ibid., March, 1965.

Though the events at Berkeley are the most sustained and revolutionary of their kind, they are not unique. A short-lived demonstration by thousands of students at Syracuse University protested an administration decision last year to continue classes almost until Christmas, instead of giving students the pre-Christmas week-end off. Similar, less publicized student protests over a variety of issues—student dress, timing of examinations, or the regulation of alcohol use, to take a few examples—have occurred in a large number of schools. We can understand such protests by looking at the circumstances under which students come to have autonomy on campus.

Consider one possible model of the situation in which students have autonomy in campus activities. For convenience, we can call this the "old" model, though I do not know whether it ever was characteristic of many campuses.[12] In this model, the campus is relatively small. Some large proportion of the students belong to fraternities and sororities; perhaps more important, that proportion increases with years in school because attrition is greater among unaffiliated students, so that seniors are overwhelmingly Greek. Fraternity men (and, to a lesser degree, sorority women) hold top offices in most major campus organizations, control the student newspaper and student government and, through a loose coalition, achieve some kind of concerted policy in student activities.

---

[12] I have drawn heavily, for my description of the "old model," on Blanche Geer, "Students and Politics," a paper presented at the meetings of the International Political Science Association in Geneva, September, 1964.

In such a set-up, students have a good deal of autonomy because they have real power, although a limited amount, with which to bargain for freedom from administrative interference with their affairs. Fraternities, by and large, own and run their own houses, pay the housemothers who in effect serve as part of the administration, and police themselves (although in cases of flagrant misconduct the administration intervenes, thus saving university officials expense and worry; should the fraternities cease to perform that function, the university must of necessity take it over, even though it would rather not). Students thus have the power that comes from being able to withhold co-operation in the area of living group discipline.

Student government, to take another example, seldom does anything with which the administration is not in complete accord. But a student government controlled by a coalition of Greeks could, if it wanted and dared, take such action and have some hope of gaining substantial support from a largely Greek student body. In particular, the thorny question of the involvement of campus organizations in off-campus political issues may lie within the student government's jurisdiction. It may act very effectively to prevent off-campus issues from ever coming to the surface or, alternatively, may allow or even insist on their disucssion by student organizations. It may grant official recognition to "troublesome" student organizations or refuse to do so. Student government office holders thus have the power that comes of being able to direct the actions of student organizations into channels that may or may not be pleasing to the administration.

The editor and reporters of the campus paper likewise have substantial power on a campus so organized. Every administration does things it would rather not have made public. Energetic student reporters may uncover the story and then face the dilemma of whether to publish it or not. If it chooses not to it puts the administration in its debt. Granted that the administration might remove an editor who displeased it by publishing such material (or editorial material displeasing on other grounds, as for instance because it will stir up conservative enemies of the university); but an editor supported by a coalition of powerful fraternities and other influential campus organizations could make it very embarrassing for an administration that tried to unseat him.

Students in the "old" university would have power because, through the network of fraternities and other organizations they controlled by means of interlocking directorates and informal co-ordination of policy, they would be able to mobilize a large proportion of the student body to co-operate with administration desires or to withhold that co-operation. Student leaders would not have to rely on organizational discipline alone to gain the support of other students. Because they are able to parcel out desired organizational positions to students in other years of school, students who desire such patronage as a way of building a successful student career provide willing support. In short, the leaders on such a campus have carrots as well as sticks to use as sanctions.

Perhaps I have said enough to indicate that on the kind of campus I am discussing students would have power enough to make an only ordinarily astute administrator take the leaders of, let us say, the controlling Greek coalition into his confidence and consult with them on any major policy changes that directly affected students. And he might further be quite ready to listen to any suggestions they had for major or minor changes in administrative practice, ranging from changes in rules and procedures for student discipline to the dates of examinations or holidays. A useful system of reciprocal favors might grow up, in which an administrator would allow the students the autonomy to run their affairs and would even take their advice on many topics, in return for student co-operation when and where he needed it. Students would have, under such an arrangement, substantial autonomy and a realistic feeling that their wishes were being taken into account in the formation of university policy, even though the formal constitution of the university granted them little power. The desire for autonomy and the experience of responsible action contained in student culture would be fulfilled.

Consider now what happens to such an arrangement in the wake of the tremendous growth universities are experiencing. As student bodies grow larger and larger (the Berkeley campus serves approximately 27,000 students), the Greek system, unable to grow as rapidly, contains a smaller and smaller proportion of students. More and more students live in dormitories, whose residents are much less subject to group discipline than fraternity members, or in rooms in the community at large, where they may well be members of no organized group at all. (Students in dormitories might conceivably organize, but the university lessens their autonomy by taking ultimate financial responsibility, paying counselors and thus preventing the financial independence which makes the fraternity less subject to administrative restriction. In addition, dormitories have no organized alumni who can independently exert pressure on college administrators.) The extensive network of social control among students, which provides a group of top leaders who can speak for their followers to the administration and whose followers will go along with their suggestions for action, which we saw to be characteristic of the "old" model, disappears, for students who belong to nothing make up their own minds about what they will do.

Such a campus may fairly be called disorganized or, perhaps better, unorganized. No stable system of reciprocal obligations can grow up between administrators and students, because no one can speak for the students and no student can issue directives about what students should do with any assurance of being listened to; there is no one for the administration to bargain with. I suspect, though I have no systematic evidence, that this is the character of the Berkeley campus on which the free speech demonstrations took place.

Without the system of reciprocal obligations characteristic of the "old" model, students have little power and little voice in the affairs of the university. Of course, they had no formally legitimate voice in the "old" model either, but they were able to exercise influence on the actions of university functionaries, to prevent them from interfering in some kinds of student activities and to see that student wishes were taken account of in official decisions. Lacking both formal and informal power, students no longer have autonomy, for there is nothing to protect them from the exercise of arbitrary administrative discretion; and they thus have no opportunity for the adult experiences they so strongly desire.

Under these conditions, students grow dissatisfied. And their dissatisfaction will tend increasingly to take the form of a constitutional question, a question about the distribution of power between students and university rather than one restricted to the specific issue at hand. In the "old" university, students and administration disagreed often enough over issues: student discipline, timing of exams, rules governing drinking, parking privileges, distribution of athletic tickets, or political activity—almost anything could become an issue. Issues were decided through bargaining and compromise, each side cognizant of the sanctions the other could bring to bear. Student leaders, knowing they had informal power under the existing arrangement, were not disposed to question the formal constitution of the campus which denied them a legitimate voice in administrative decisions; and the remainder of the students, members of organized groups, followed the leaders. Students did not feel left out of things, even when they lost, for they knew that though they lost today they might win tomorrow and, if not tomorrow, certainly the day after.

When students, however, do not have any informal power, as I have suggested they do not on a large campus like Berkeley because of their lack of organization, they do feel left out of things. They have nothing to bargain with and no one bargains with them. And, feeling left out of things, having no way, either formal or informal, of making their weight felt, they do not limit their complaint to the issue at hand, but move on, as the Berkeley students did, to demand a constitutional change. They use the immediate issue to demand a formally legitimate voice in campus government.

When the Berkeley episode began, a faculty member there said to me that he thought the students were forever trying to provoke clashes with the administration, that the issue of free speech was simply a pretext for conflict and that the students, though they happened this time to have chosen an issue in which right was on their side, would have been just as happy to make any issue the pretext for battle. If my interpretation is correct, there is much to what he said. But his remark carried the implication that the students' fight was irrational, fighting for the sake of fighting. Such a view is common when the fight is not over free speech but rather over such relatively trivial (from the faculty point of view) matters as the scheduling of exams or vacations, whether men and women can visit in one another's dormitory rooms, or whether alcohol can be served at house parties. And that implication is, I think, incorrect.

Student rebellions of the Berkeley type are not irrational outbursts. Nor are they an angry response to the rootlessness, anonymity and *anomie* of student life at the mass university. I spoke of revolution earlier and I did not use the term lightly. Student rebellions are revolutionary in the truest sense. They aim at a reallocation of power that will give them, formally and legitimately, what students in the older kind of university had informally and covertly: participation in all decisions about campus life that affect student interests. They are not a reaction to anomie, but to the disenfranchisement of students that has developed simultaneously with the conditions alleged to create anomie.

I do not mean to say that students in the "old" university never engaged in mass action or episodes of elementary collective behavior. They did. But it is instructive to consider the typical kind of incident that occurred: the panty raid. We do not know what kind of student dissatisfactions lay in the background of the recurrent raids on women's dormitories. No doubt the conventional administrative decision to separate men's and women's housing had something to do with it. But these collective outbursts were purely expressive. They were not a tactic in an over-all strategy designed to effect a reallocation of power. And therein lies their difference from the planned and disciplined measures of civil disobedience used by the Berkeley Free Speech Movement.

Student rebellions arise out of student culture because one of the foci of student culture is a desire for autonomy in student affairs, for the lodging of some real power in the hands of students so that they can experience in their campus activities the adult responsibilities that go with the exercise of power and thus move further toward their goal of maturity.

We can expect to see (indeed, have seen since the late fifties) more and more student rebellions, as the growth of American universities produces increasingly the conditions which lead to the disenfranchisement of students. We can also expect that, as the battle is joined, students will increasingly make use of the tactics of civil disobedience, which are more suited to revolutionary conflict than the tactics of bargaining and compromise which served them so well under an older kind of administrative regime. The lessons of Berkeley will not be lost on students elsewhere. If the circumstances of university life do not allow students informal power based in situations of reality in campus social structure, they will demand and fight for formal constitutional changes.

Conclusion

I hope that the two examples I have given of how student culture is involved in the changes taking place in the university will be ample enough to suggest further possibilities. A more systematic analysis, considering current trends as they separately affect the conditions of student life and as those effects are interpreted by students in the terms suggested by student culture, would surely suggest many other examples. Similarly, further research on college organization will undoubtedly reveal much variation in the patterning of student culture in colleges with differing kinds of recruitment, organization, and regional background. There is no doubt, for instance, that an important part of the Berkeley story is that the student body contained a great many militant political types, blooded in the massive San Francisco civil rights demonstrations of the previous year and in Mississippi in the summer of 1964. A university that had no such students would find itself facing a somewhat different set of problems. My remarks, then, ought to be taken as a beginning to the analysis of the role of student culture, not an end. As social scientists always seem to say, further research is needed.

THE OUTSIDERS: EXTERNAL FORCES AFFECTING AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.

Babbidge examines the role of the "outsiders" in bringing about change in the university. "The larger society of the United States has had a profound influence on the course of American higher education," he says in an observation echoed in Corson's statement that the "truly major changes in university life have been initiated from the outside." Babbidge examines the strategy that administrators might employ when considering new ideas. He contends that many ideas for change are squelched by the administrators themselves out of a false fear that they would be ill-received by "outsiders"—the church, alumni, government, or other groups in society.

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., is President of the University of Connecticut. He has been a teacher in the Department of American Studies at Yale University. Dr. Babbidge has also served as vice-president of the American Council on Education, as a special assistant to the U. S. Commissioner of Education and later as director of the Division of Higher Education, USOE. Babbidge is co-author (with Robert M. Rosenzweig) of The Federal Interest in Higher Education (1962).

The relationship of educational institutions to the larger society that spawned and supports them has long been a subject of interest to both parties. We wonder increasingly just who calls the shots in higher education. Are educational institutions truly independent entities or are they subject to some definable control and influence from the outside? A certain amount of folklore has grown up around the relationship, and there has been a tendency to express differences of opinion in platitudes: we may "keep politics out of education" or we may say that "education is too important to be left to the educators." There has been a notable and regrettable lack of clear thinking and talking about the whole complex relationship. Indeed, there are those who have thought it best not to explore the relationship too fully, preferring to leave in doubt issues which if resolved might be injurious to education.

"Where the apple reddens, never pry—
Lest we lose our Edens, Eve and I."

But regardless of what one thinks the relationship of institutionalized higher education and society ought to be, it seems dangerous to proceed without knowing what, in fact, it has been and is. Indeed, what might be is presumably influenced or delimited in some ways by what has been. And an exploration of what has been may well suggest a wider range of possibilities for the future, for better or for worse.

Apart from these more or less abstract reasons for wanting to know more about the role of society in the policy and operations of higher education, it seems clear that we will be pressed to clarify that role, in any event. Aggressive and vocal, if small, elements in our society (and in our educational communities), not content with the modus vivendi, have discovered ways of forcing the resolution of issues long allowed, by more or less common consent, to remain vague. The Mario Savios of our world will not be content to live with the "rolling consensus" that has been the basis for resolving strains and tensions in the management of higher education.

In trying to delineate the part that non-educators have played in influencing the course of higher education, one can only employ a process of successive approximation, precisely because we have historically sought to stop short of clarity and precision in these matters. But, starting at one end of the scale, it seems clear that Professor Cowley of Stanford has pretty well destroyed the legend of the "community of scholars" as a historical phenomenon.[1] The notion that it was once possible for scholars anywhere to operate a self-directed community, free of interference from generous patrons, simply doesn't hold true under scrutiny.

The American experience is even clearer on this point. The decision to place Harvard College under the control of a board of overseers composed of magistrates and ministers was to set a pattern that has been followed almost universally in this country. The legal (and to a very great extent the actual) responsibility for American colleges and universities is vested in a non-academic group of citizens. In all instances this has had the effect of limiting the degree of influence of scholars over the destinies of an institution. In many cases it has served to "allow in" the influence of non-academic thinking, and in a few instances (as for example, where trustees are elected by the public) it has encouraged popular influence over academic affairs. But it must not be overlooked that, in the instance of public institutions at least, this same device—the trusteeship—has served to screen out or modify the public's influence over higher education. It may not be inaccurate to say that trusteeship cuts both ways; that, like the sea, it has a moderating influence on temperature. It may discourage uninhibited academic exercise, but it can also guard against irresponsible public intrusion. Be that as it may, the device of lay control of educational institutions is one of the central facts upon which our exploration must be based. The board of trustees is, in all probability, the key to much of what has happened and will happen in the control and governance of American higher education.

But having ruled out the existence of pure, self-directing academic communities, we have explained that the public (or parts of that public) does have a voice in American educational policy. The citizen is not a total outsider as we have organized our higher education structure. It remains for us to assess the extent to which the public has taken advantage of its built-in access to higher education. I am going to suggest, as a kind of hypothesis, that the larger society of the United States has had a profound influence on the course of American higher education; that this influence has been resisted by established institutions, and that the public has had to resort to the establishment of new institutions in order to make its influence felt.

---

1. William H. Cowley, "Some Myths about Professors, Presidents, and Trustees," Teachers College Record, no. 2 (March 1962).

A little more than a century ago, the American people sensed that they stood on the threshold of a revolutionary period. They were, in fact, on the eve of great revolutions in agriculture and industry. But established institutions of higher education seemed unresponsive to these needs. Some astute educators, like Francis Wayland of Brown, sought to adapt their institutions to new public needs. In his 1850 report to the Brown Corporation, he wrote:

> We must carefully survey the wants of the various classes of the community—and adapt our courses of instruction—for the benefit of all classes. The demand for general education in our country is pressing and universal. The want of that science, which alone can lay the foundation of our eminent success in the useful arts, is extensively felt.

Others, outside the framework of the educational establishment, bemoaned the lack of responsiveness and, in effect, threatened an educational revolution. These are the words of Jonathan Baldwin Turner of Illinois:

> The idea has got abroad in the world, that some practical liberal system of education for the industrial classes . . . can be devised, and this idea is not likely soon to be stopped; it seems to work beneath the surface of human thought with the energy of volcanic fire.[2]

Such public sentiment did erupt in the passage of the so-called Land-Grant College Act of 1862, a radical piece of legislation that threw the weight of the federal government behind the creation (or conversion) of a whole new class of educational institutions. These institutions were dedicated to two important public purposes, theretofore neglected by the educational establishment:

> (1) the broadening of curriculum to include agriculture, a nascent science of engineering, and natural and applied sciences;
>
> (2) the broadening of the clientele of higher education, to include, for example, the poor and the weaker sex—the sons and daughters of the industrial classes.

The experience of 103 years is sufficient, I think, to state that this is the most impressive single evidence in American history of the impact that outsiders can have upon education. For we have now not only the vast and vigorous system of land-grant institutions, but also the general educational acceptance of the purposes of the original movement. If experience is at all a fair test, history has confirmed the people right and adjudged the educators of mid-nineteenth century America wrong. But right or wrong, the will of the people has prevailed, and educational practice has responded.

---

[2] Speech to farmers' convention at Granville, Ill., March 18, 1851, "Plan for an Industrial University for the State of Illinois."

Indeed, one can wonder, as John Gardner has, whether we would not still be locked into the trivium and quadrivium, had it not been for the influence of outsiders. For it seems clear that whatever other qualities it may have, the educational establishment—institutionalized higher education—is conservative and resistant to change. Even the radical land-grant institutions show signs of shuddering conservatism when it comes to the educational needs of the late twentieth century. Already the people, frustrated by the existence of educational voids and vacuums, seek to create new institutions—frequently called community colleges—to do the work that existing institutions will not or cannot do. And thus the "People's Colleges" of yesteryear are replaced by yet another new class of institutions—infra dig in the eyes of the establishment, but dedicated to meeting educational needs as the people see them. Like successive waves of immigrants, newly arrived educational institutions do the least prestigious work; in time they are moved up the ladder of academic respectability by the arrival of even new institutions on the educational shores.

Apparently, in our kind of society, the people get what they want in higher education (given the wherewithal to do it). What they want may be considered totally alien to responsible educational thinking. They may want job-oriented training when the word "vocationalism" is a dirty word in academic circles. Or they may want education to serve non-educational goals, as when the Secretary of Labor proposes compulsory education through the fourteenth grade in order to reduce unemployment. But we dare not forget that Horace Mann sold the idea of public schools largely on the grounds that they would mitigate the economic evils of child labor practices; and in that instance, the people did the educationally right thing for the wrong (or at least extraneous) reasons.

To say that the people ultimately have their way in education is not to say that they have to overrun the establishment. More often, the wishes of the outside influences on higher education are likely to coincide with the wishes of the institution. To be sure, these outside agencies are also likely to be sponsors or patrons whose principal contribution to the institution is financial. What the grantor wishes for the institution may well be good for the institution, but it is nonetheless true, in the words of Mary Poppins, that "a spoonful of sugar helps the medicine go down."

"In a most delightful way," the federal government, which must be presumed to express the will of our society, has helped institutions do for themselves what they needed to do for their own health and vitality. It is hard to imagine American higher education without the benefit of the billions of federal dollars that have gone into it. The outside influence has been great in this direct sense.

But there have been some secondary influences of federal involvement as well, and not all of these have coincided with the wishes of the academic community. And the real questions here are not whether the federal government should be doing these things, but whether individual institutions have the fortitude to pass up federal funds in order to avoid these unfortunate side effects. We can argue that federal programs should be more wisely administered in the interests of higher education, and we can struggle within the context of government to bring this about; but our words and our struggles will be ineffective if we can't, as institutions, ever say "no." The external influence that comes bearing dollars is one of the most difficult with which to cope. Insofar as this influence seeks to distort institutional values, it must be thought of as more than external—it is alien.

Another aspect of outside influence is suggested by the frequently expressed view that the public—which does have a say about education—doesn't really understand. Many educators fear the influence of the public because it is ill-informed and unsophisticated. Much of what we might call, in this context, external influence on higher education takes the form of anticipating outside reaction. Many a good educational endeavor has died on the drawing boards because some timid educator assumed that it would offend the church or the alumni or the public. If I read the history of this correctly, it is more common for educators to underestimate than to overestimate the public's capacity to tolerate academic innovation or change. Though we have concrete and disturbing instances in which the public has "shot down" educators and institutions for their failure to conform to social or political or educational convention, we have examples of many more instances in which institutions and educators have grounded themselves by playing it too safe.

Given the fact that our educational institutions are constructed in such a way that social influences can legitimately influence established institutions; and given the fact that the people have the capacity to get done what they think ought to be done; a strong case can be made for the position that there is remarkably little public—or outside—intrusion on academic institutions. The influence of trustees, for example, is likely to be felt in a negative way, when something happens (or is contemplated) in an educational setting that is thought to be offensive to public sentiment. Even then, they are likely only to ask that the "something" be clearly justified by academic considerations.

The greatest area of weakness on the academic side of this relationship is our failure—or our unwillingness—to present, publicly, the academic justification for the things that we do or want to do. We have a tendency to think that academic freedom is a concept the rationale of which is well and widely understood; that when a legislator or a clergyman or an alumnus protests something, all we have to do is cry "tilt." In fact, we would do well to take advantage of every such instance to restate—and hopefully illustrate—the sturdy and extensive foundations of the concept of academic freedom. Academic freedom is an ultimate protection of learning, and not something to be glibly and unnecessarily employed to defend our actions. And we do well to remember that academic freedom is not to be confused with immunity from criticism. As Whitney Griswold once observed, eternal vigilance is the minimal price of liberty; the cost can run much, much higher.

But there is no point in deluding ourselves. Some of the prices that the public can from time to time demand are too great to pay. There are bigots and interest groups and anti-intellectuals and mad people among our citizenry, and they try from time to time to destroy the most sacred of our educational values. Our ability to defend ourselves against such assaults is imperfect. But certainly it is enhanced by the existence of an informed board of trustees and by an informed citizenry. We need to do a lot more talking to our trustees and to the citizenry in general about our purposes and values than we have in the past.

Most American colleges and universities have wanted and do want to be reasonably responsive to the needs of the people. And yet they also recognize the dangers of abdicating educational judgment and responsibility to the vox populi. Professor Muscatine of Berkeley has said of the concept of public service by educational institutions:

> If the road to hell is paved with good intentions in education as elsewhere, then there is nowhere better paving material than in the con-

> cept of Public Service. In the sixteen years since I joined this faculty I have heard more bad educational policy justified in the name of Public Service than by any other invocation, human or divine. But again, I do not need to alert anyone here to the loud promise of mediocrity inherent in such notions as of the University as "servant" to industry or indeed even as servant to the State.[3]

How do we avoid the mistakes of the past—the era of fly-tieing courses and other abuses committed in the name of popular responsiveness? I think it helps to borrow from economics a very valid distinction between demand and need. Demand is obvious enough—it is easily measured in the mail and in the voices of those who would have us act. Need is far more complex, elusive. It requires careful and even scientific analysis, and it requires above all an informed judgment. And in a sense this is one of the highest functions of educational administration, this winnowing out of the important from the unimportant. Recognizing that external influences and ideas are potentially powerful forces for progress, and that they can as well subvert and even destroy educational values, the educator must make the fateful choice.

And it is not a simple choice. Until 1893, Yale College was Connecticut's land-grant institution. In that year, the State Grange rose up in indignation, contending that Yale was not sufficiently responsive to the needs of Connecticut agriculture. The state's endowment was transferred to the little Storrs Agricultural School. Storrs (the Connecticut Agricultural College) did what the farmers demanded: it produced trained farmers. But when one considers the agricultural activities of its successor (the University of Connecticut), one is forced to concede that the emphasis placed on highly scientific attention to the foundations of agriculture is remarkably similar to the work that Yale wanted to emphasize in 1893. Yale's decision to insist on what Connecticut agriculture needed, rather than what Connecticut agriculturists demanded, was in a sense fatal. The willingness of a little agricultural school to accede to their demands and then (over half a century) to educate farmers to their true needs, was the making of a university. In trying to assess the wave of demand and the shoreline of need, it may be well to keep in mind both the force of the farmer and the persistence of the latter.

---

3. Charles Muscatine, "The Impact of Technology on Teaching: The Case for the Teacher," a speech given at the University of California Faculty Conference, Davis, March 22-25, 1964.

THE UNIVERSITY AS A DISTINCTIVE ORGANIZATION

by

Peter M. Blau

Blau considers four distinctive aspects of university organization that differentiate it from most other complex organizations, and that contain important implications for the process of change. They are: (1) in universities, the usual relationship between line and staff is reversed; (2) there is no clear boundary between the university and the public; (3) universities have two different underlying and competing purposes, teaching and research; (4) universities are institutions of social change. He addresses himself to the paradox implied in the last of these. He states: "Institutions are social arrangements for perpetuating social patterns and promoting social stability. . . . How can one establish an institution to generate social change?"

Peter M. Blau is Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago. He has taught also at Cornell University and at Wayne State University. He now holds a five-year Ford Foundation master fellowship in business administration. Professor Blau is author of The Dynamics of Bureaucracy, Bureaucracy in Modern Society, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach (co-author), and Exchange and Power in Social Life, just published. He is editor of the American Journal of Sociology.

In summary, I think it can be said that outside or external influence in American higher education has been great. The influence has been in some instances bad or unfortunate, but far more often it has been constructive and helpful. Our institutions are, I think, more vigorous and strong than they would have been without such influence.

The procedures we have developed for accommodating external influence are ingenious—most notably the concept of trusteeship. Recognizing that there are inevitable differences in values between the world of the academician and the world of the people as a whole, we have created an instrument that, properly functioning, expresses the true needs and highest interests of the people and protects the essential values of academic inquiry and expression. That it works imperfectly is not cause for dismay; that it works as well as it has is cause for satisfaction.

No institution is immune to forces beyond its campus. No institution can be or should be. And I think no institution should aspire to be so immune. But insofar as any institution accommodates such external influences it assumes a responsibility of awesome proportions—the responsibility to distinguish need from demand, the important from the unimportant. It assumes the responsibility to assure that, in its desire to be timely, it does not do injury to the timeless.

THE UNIVERSITY AS A DISTINCTIVE ORGANIZATION

by

Peter M. Blau

Blau considers four distinctive aspects of university organization that differentiate it from most other complex organizations, and that contain important implications for the process of change. They are: (1) in universities, the usual relationship between line and staff is reversed; (2) there is no clear boundary between the university and the public; (3) universities have two different underlying and competing purposes, teaching and research; (4) universities are institutions of social change. He addresses himself to the paradox implied in the last of these. He states: "Institutions are social arrangements for perpetuating social patterns and promoting social stability. . . . How can one establish an institution to generate social change?"

Peter M. Blau is Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago. He has taught also at Cornell University and at Wayne State University. He now holds a five-year Ford Foundation master fellowship in business administration. Professor Blau is author of The Dynamics of Bureaucracy, Bureaucracy in Modern Society, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach (co-author), and Exchange and Power in Social Life, just published. He is editor of the American Journal of Sociology.

I want to look in this paper at the modern university from the perspective of a theorist of complex organizations.[1] The question raised at the start is: what are the distinctive traits of the university as a complex organization? The plan is to examine the implications of these traits for the role of the university in modern society, with particular attention to their implications for the dynamics of social change, both within the university itself, and in the society at large as influenced by the university.

The main themes are, first, that large universities are essential for progress in a modern democratic society. They serve as vital centers for the advancement of knowledge as well as for the production of personnel that can further advance knowledge. Second, complex administrative structures—bureaucratic administrations, if you will—are inevitable in large organizations such as universities. Finally, the advancement of knowledge in the context of a complex organization poses dilemmas which the modern university must face.

Four Distinctive Traits of the Organization of Universities

Four characteristics that distinguish universities from other complex organizations are singled out for attention. To be sure, these four traits are not unique to the university but can be found also in some other organizations; several illustrations will indicate this. Nevertheless, the traits are atypical and differentiate the university from most complex organizations.

Reversal of Staff and Line

A hierarchy of managerial authority is a basic characteristic of formal organizations. To be sure, there are wide variations in the degree of centralization of decision-making power. However, all complex organizations have a hierarchical structure with the main lines of authority flowing from top management to the operating personnel engaged in "production." This is true whether the latter entails actual production, as in a factory, or providing services, as in a post office. Most large organizations also have various staff experts. These experts perform auxiliary functions and serve as consultants to line managers, and they generally are not part of the main line of authority.

---

[1] The assistance of Nathalie O. Funk in preparing this paper is gratefully acknowledged.

One distinctive trait of universities is that the relationship between staff and line is reversed there. As Etzioni has noted, staff experts carry out the universities' main "production" function—teaching and research—while line authority is vested in the university administrators.[2] The administrators' responsibility is not to supervise teaching and research but to maintain the auxiliary services necessary for performing these functions, just as the staff in other organizations provides the auxiliary services necessary to carry out the production functions. A similar reversal of the usual relationship between staff and line tends to occur in hospitals and other highly professionalized organizations.

The relationship between administrative authority and professional staff raises the problem of bureaucratization. The formalized rules of procedure and the evaluation of performance in terms of limited criteria of efficiency rather than professional quality that are characteristic of bureaucratization conflict with the expectations of professionals who are trained to assume responsibility for performing services in conformity with internalized standards. Professionals tend to feel thwarted by conditions that interfere with their ability to furnish adequate services as defined by the standards of their profession. But from the viewpoint of administrators, who are in positions of authority, administrative considerations sometimes do outweigh professional ones. The administrator's responsibility for the maintenance and growth of the organization recurrently constrains him to set aside one or the other professional objective for the sake of the larger organization, thereby frustrating the efforts of the professional staff. Such conflicts between staff and line have often been described.[3]

This conflict between staff and line is probably no more severe in universities than in other organizations. Indeed, my impression is that it is less severe there than in many other complex organizations. In universities, however, this conflict affects not merely auxiliary personnel but the main body of "production" personnel. The danger of bureaucratic domination of faculty has frequently been noted. For example, the Nobel Prize-winning physicist, Robert A. Millikan, discusses in his autobiography the development of a semi-military form of organization in universities with lines of authority and responsibility clearly marked.[4] He argues that "wherever action is more important than wisdom, as in military operation and to a lesser extent in American business, it represents at any rate a natural, if not a necessary, mode of organization."[5] But bureaucratic patterns also predominate in most universities, placing control of the distribution of authority, prestige, and income in administrative hands. Presthus stresses that the resulting subordination of highly skilled and learned men has been responsible for a considerable amount of alienation among faculty members.[6]

---

[2] Amitai Etzioni, "Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness," Administrative Science Quarterly, no. 4 (1959), pp. 43-67.

[3] See Melville Dalton, "Conflicts between Staff and Line Managerial Officers," American Sociological Review, no. 15 (1950), pp. 342-51, and Dalton, Men Who Manage (New York: Wiley, 1959).

The remedy usually proposed is to free faculty from domination by administration and to appoint administrators who are more sympathetic to faculty needs. There are undoubtedly university administrators who are domineering and lacking in understanding of the needs of scientific and scholarly pursuits, particularly in minor universities, and removing such administrators would be beneficial. The authoritarian administrator, however, is simply a pathological manifestation of an underlying conflict that is endemic. The suggested remedy of replacing bad administrators with good ones mistakes the symptom for the cause; it blames individuals for conflicts that are rooted in social conditions. Although outstanding administrators may be able to alleviate the problem, even they are powerless to eradicate the structural roots which provoke the conflict.

The conflict stems from the fact that the administration, not the faculty, is primarily responsible for attaining the goals of the university as a whole. The administrator's orientation toward constructing new buildings, attracting better students, and offering a wider variety of courses reflects his interest in enhancing the position of his university in competition with others. Simultaneously, he is often under pressure to expand services and facilities without a proportionate increase in costs. In contrast to the global commitments of administrators to the university, the major commitment of faculty members is to advancement of knowledge in their own disciplines. Both administrators and faculty members are interested in their own prestige and careers, of course, but the administrator's rewards are more directly tied to his contributions to the organization as a whole, while those of the faculty member are rooted in his contributions to his particular discipline. The requirements of large-scale administration and the interests of various groups of scholars recurrently come into conflict, forcing the most sympathetic administrator occasionally to act contrary to the interest of some faculty group. The underlying conflict must be faced and not projected upon bad administrators.

---

[4] Robert A. Millikan, The Autobiography of Robert A. Millikan (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950), p. 225.

[5] Ibid. (Italics in original.)

[6] Robert Presthus, The Organization Society (New York: Knopf, 1962), p. 24.

No Clear Boundary between Organization and Public

The second distinctive trait of universities is the lack of clear boundaries between the organization and its public. Formal organizations, as a rule, differentiate between members of the organization and relevant non-members. For example, explicit distinctions are drawn between department store personnel and customers, between welfare agency officials and clients, or between members of the police department and criminals. Informal groups, in contrast to formal organizations, often do not have clear membership boundaries: friendship cliques, for instance, are often composed both of core members, who are close mutual friends, and marginal members, who are close to some of the group's core members but not all of them.

Whereas most formal organizations tend to draw clear boundaries between the members of the organization and its public, this is not true of universities. The lack of a clear boundary is due to the ambiguous status of students, who are in some sense the university's clients and in another sense its members. When one speaks of the size of a university, for example, one usually refers to the student body, which indicates that students are defined as more than simply the university's clientele. Furthermore, for a period of several years students spend most of their lives in a university, becoming an integral part of it rather than being a mere transient public. Nevertheless, students do not produce the university's services but are clients who receive them.

Their encompassing nature makes universities in principle similar to the "total institutions" Goffman has distinguished from other organizations. "A basic social arrangement in modern society is that the individual tends to sleep, play, and work in different places, with different coparticipants, under different authorities, and without an overall rational plan."[7] Total institutions, in contrast, are organizations in which these barriers ordinarily separating the spheres of life have disappeared and in which most human needs for whole blocks of people are met simultaneously, as exemplified by armies, mental hospitals, and prisons. University students also live, work, sleep, and play within the university, at least, in the residential universities. But while most total institutions have walls restricting movement, university students are relatively free to come and go. Total institutions can be differentiated by the criterion of whose lives the institution encompasses—the lives of the members, the client-public, or both. Some total institutions, such as monasteries and armies, include only members; they either have no public or the public on which they work—the enemy in the case of the army—is completely outside the institution. Reform schools are an example of a total institution that encompasses both the lives of its members—the custodial staff—and of its public—the delinquent children. Other total institutions only encompass the lives of the client public; mental hospitals exemplify this type, as do residential universities. The core members of these institutions, psychiatrists in the first case and faculty members in the second, have only an occupational commitment to the institutions and do not spend their entire lives there.

The relationship between an organization's membership and its public is pregnant with conflict. The amount of visible conflict depends, of course, on the specific situation and the organization's objectives. Conflict is much less severe in universities than in other organizations—for example, in the police department in relation to criminals, or in the army in relation to the enemy. In universities, however, conflict occurs overtly within the boundaries of the organization, as it does in mental hospitals and reform schools. This makes conflict more serious and more disruptive for the organization. The student demonstrations at Berkeley in the late months of 1964 were a manifestation of such conflict within organizational boundaries.

Two contrasting methods for dealing with conflict have been developed in other organizations like mental hospitals and reform schools. The custodial approach, on the one hand, defines the organization's goal as the confinement and management of inmates. This intensifies the conflict between members and inmates but makes it less of a threat to the organization because methods of dealing with overt conflict are an explicit part of organizational procedures. The treatment approach, on the other hand, defines organizational goals as resocialization and rehabilitation. This lessens overt conflict but makes the organization more liable to being affected by it, because such conflict endangers the very objectives of the organization. The former solution is clearly inappropriate for universities, since their goal is not the confinement of students. The latter approach is appropriate for one of the universities' goals, that of teaching. However, it requires a strong commitment to service to students, and it endangers the other goal of universities, that of research.

---

[7] Erving Goffman, Asylums (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1961), pp. 5-6.

Twofold Purpose: Teaching and Research

The third distinctive trait of universities is that they have two fundamental purposes: teaching and research. Although these short hand labels are used, they are intended to refer to more than merely spending time in the classroom or on research. The major commitment of the institutional structure as well as of individual staff members is to two kinds of pursuit. On the one hand, there is a commitment to helping shape the development of tomorrow's intellectual elite at the time when most of them make the decisions most important for the future. On the other hand, there is a commitment to providing the advancement in knowledge that serves as the foundation for future progress.

The twofold purpose of universities is not merely an instance of multiple objectives, which many other organizations have too. A single manufacturer may produce several products, and the same government agency provides both unemployment benefits and employment service, but these examples are more akin to the different specialized departments in a university; the different objectives serve the same underlying purpose in each case: the production of goods to be sold at a profit or helping the unemployed. Teaching and research, by contrast, constitute different underlying purposes.

An analogous case is furnished by labor unions and political parties, which also have double aims. Workers organize unions for the purpose of establishing common courses of action in the collective interest. In order to reach agreement on collective action, democratic processes and freedom of dissent must govern the association. However, the union also has the purpose of implementing the decisions reached and thereby improving the members' standard of living in the struggle with management. A strong, efficient organization is necessary for this purpose. Therefore, democratic processes are often set aside for the sake of building an effective union. In this case, the free discussion of disagreements among members, required to achieve consensus, comes into conflict with the efficiency of the organization.

The situation is similar for political parties. In order for voters to express political preferences, especially in a two-party system, it is necessary for the parties to have a democratic structure, as exemplified by primary elections. Victory at the polls, however, depends on an efficient party organization, and a political machine promotes such efficiency, though at the expense of internal democracy. Freedom of dissent and efficiency are both essential to the political process, but the two conflict with each other.[8]

A similar tension, between teaching and research, is found in universities. This is not a case of conflict in resource allocation, however, it is a case of organizational incompatibility; the optimum environment for maturation and education is not necessarily optimal for original research. In addition, it is a case of incentive incompatibility; concern with scientific achievement comes into conflict with endeavors to produce men who will surpass oneself.

Where is one to find a solution to the problem of incompatible organizational requirements? Political parties and labor unions generally have not found one. (A notable exception is the International Typographical Union, which has had an institutionalized two-party system for over half a century.[9] The solution developed by society at large is separate institutions for each purpose. There are democratic institutions, such as the election machinery, where freedom of dissent is expected to reign. To implement democratically derived decisions, there are government agencies where efficiency is expected to reign. Even here, conflict recurrently emerges, however, as when the suppression of free speech is advocated in the interest of national security.

---

[8] The conflict between freedom of dissent and efficiency also occurs in corporations. For a general treatment of this problem, see Peter M. Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society (New York: Random House, 1956), pp. 105-10.

[9] S. M. Lipset, Martin Trow, and James Coleman, Union Democracy (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956).

The same solution, separate institutions for each purpose, has been partly adopted in higher education. Small colleges concentrate on teaching, socialization, and service to the student, and specialized research institutes, such as the Rockefeller Institute, concentrate on advancement of knowledge. While this solution is possible for single organizations, it is not possible for the entire institution of higher learning. The two functions, although in conflict in some respects, are in other respects complementary and must go together. The major universities, where advancement of knowledge goes hand in hand with the grooming of future researchers, fill an important need.

Institutionalization of Innovation

The last special feature of universities involves the institutionalization of social change. Specifically, universities are institutional arrangements for regular production of two essential ingredients of social change. The first is original ideas and the second is men to implement these ideas and produce others. It must be emphasized that universities have the functions of developing both new ideas and the producers of new ideas; merely communicating the most recent results of research and training men to apply them could be done in separate institutions. Indeed, the best small colleges probably serve these educational functions better than large universities. However, training men who will produce original research requires apprenticeships and increasing involvement in research. Since this socializing function cannot be carried out in separate organizations, neither small colleges nor specialized research organizations offer a solution to the institutional dilemma. Although the requirements of training future scientists and of conducting research are incompatible in some respects, just as the requirements of internal democracy and effectiveness are incompatible in the case of labor unions and political parties, the two functions are in other respects complementary and must be carried out together. Major universities are needed for social innovation to occur because students can learn to be scientists and scholars only where research is conducted.

There is a crucial problem inherent in institutionalizing social change. Institutions are social arrangements for perpetuating social patterns and promoting social stability. Hence, the university's objective poses a paradox. How can one establish an institution to generate social change? Specifically, how can one create conditions that regularly and even routinely promote creativity and originality?

Democracy is another institution designed to regularize social change; it is a stable social arrangement which permits the peaceful implementation of new ideas within the framework of existing institutions. Whether the focus is on personnel or ideology, democracy stabilizes political change and obviates the need for violent eruptions, such as revolutions. However, democratic governments are constantly faced with conflicts between forces attempting to change social conditions and those opposing change.

In the army, still another aspect of the stability-change conflict can be seen, for the task of the army seems in some respects incompatible with the requirements of bureaucratic discipline. A bureaucracy is a highly institutionalized organization with firm, stable procedures which govern decisions, actions, and social relations. By these criteria, the army is the prototype of a bureaucracy. It is characterized by strict discipline, rigid hierarchical authority, and routinized procedures. However, since it is designed to assure uniformity, predictability, and co-ordination, bureaucracy creates problems for coping with unpredictable and changing situations, and the army is an extreme case of an organization faced with unpredictable situations and changing conditions. The combat situation is continually changing, and the explicit aim of the enemy is to invalidate all predictions that have been made. Thus, a most bureaucratized organization is also one for whose task bureaucratization is presumed to be least appropriate.

The assumption underlying this discussion is that bureaucratic discipline *helps* the army to cope with unpredictable battle conditions, though at first glance this appears contrary to bureaucratic theory. For one thing, strict lines of authority permit rapid implementation of changes in strategy which are necessitated by new conditions. In addition, disciplined compliance with routinized procedures facilitates adaptation to the fear and novelty of combat. Danger might induce panic and erratic behavior except for those patterns of action that have become second nature as the result of long training and the inculcation of discipline. In particular, disciplined routines provide a framework within which important original decisions can be made. If much behavior is automatic and requires no explicit decision, one can concentrate on the few vital decisions and alternatives that are required by the changing combat situation.

The example of the bureaucratized army may be instructive. Of course, I am not suggesting that universities would benefit by instituting an army-type regime. Nevertheless, the underlying principle of the relationship between secure knowledge and original decisions has some relevant implications for the organization of universities and other institutions that attempt to create permanent conditions which will promote originality and creative work.

Organizations and the Dynamics of Change

Major innovations in complex modern societies cannot be realized without formal organizations. To be sure, discoveries and inventions are made by individuals, but innovation, that is, the implementation of new ideas on a large scale within the society, requires the services of complex organizations as instrumental agents. For example, the automobile was invented by individuals but its large-scale manufacture and distribution depend on the co-ordinated efforts of many large organizations. Similarly, the Communist Manifesto was written by two men, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, but the attempt to implement it gave rise to the Communist Party, which is, like the army, a large bureaucratic organization.

A more recent example is the development of nuclear weapons. Individual scientists made the advances in physical knowledge required to produce a chain reaction, but large organizations were responsible for the manufacture of bombs for use in warfare. The research carried out at the University of Chicago produced the first chain reaction, and research at many other universities played a significant role in the discoveries that made nuclear weapons possible. Today, formal organizations commonly play an important, though indirect, role in social innovation, and they play the major, direct role in the inventions and discoveries underlying social innovation. More explicitly, invention is the creation of new knowledge, innovation its implementation.

Agents of Social Change and Their Internal Dynamics

In today's complex world, large organizations are needed not only to apply existing knowledge and effect social change but also to create the new knowledge and skills required for this purpose on a large scale. The solitary inventor working by himself in his study is the rare exception. The large resources in money and equipment necessary for the advancement of knowledge in most sciences are only available in large institutions. The distinctive function of the modern university is to supply two basic prerequisites of social innovation—new knowledge and men trained to implement this knowledge. Whereas the university makes these important indirect contributions to social innovation, innovations are actually realized in the typical case elsewhere—by the entrepreneur in business, the engineer in manufacturing, the politician in the legislature. Moreover, since universities are part of the establishment, most radical opposition to existing institutions originates outside their context. Nevertheless, universities figure prominently in social innovations as the source of new ideas, men qualified to implement them, and men who will produce further new ideas in the future.

The role of organizations in a changing society must be distinguished from the forces effecting change within organizations, however. The external dynamics involves the adaptation of formal organizations to changing conditions as well as the role of formal organizations as instruments of social change. The internal dynamics consists of changes that occur within an organization with growth, development of *structural complexity*, and adaptation to external conditions. For the university to fulfill its function as an agent of change, its internal structure must be responsive to the society's needs. In short, social innovations in the university's structure are recurrently required to enable it to provide the knowledge and skills needed to solve the dominant social problems.

In many respects, universities are far from being the ivory towers they are alleged to be, since their internal structure often reflects rather quickly the increasing significance of such problems as nuclear fission or population control for the external environment. While university-sponsored developments in physics or demography may in turn have substantial implications for social change, such formal organizations as labor unions and political parties tend to provide the direct impetus to change in a society. Although the university contributes to society both ideas and the men to implement them, ordinarily its efforts at structural innovation do not extend beyond its own walls. Indeed, the university protects its academic freedom by being politically neutral.[10] Finally, the internal dynamics, including actual changes as well as a readiness for structural change, is related to the external dynamics; but the two must be kept analytically distinct in order to study their relationship.

Displacement of Goals

Complex organizations often become bureaucratized. That is, they come to be characterized by a rigid hierarchy of authority; overspecialization, which sometimes results in buck-passing; an elaboration of administrative machinery and procedures; and a ritualistic conformity with detailed rules or red tape.

Michels observed this process in unions and social democratic parties in Germany.[11] These organizations were established to institute social change. Although the egalitarian ideology and objectives of these organizations would lead one to expect them to be democratically governed by their membership, in order to achieve their objectives union or party members are under pressure to build strong and effective organizations. According to Michels, the need to fortify the organizations leads to a concentration of power in the hands of the leadership and to an elaboration of administrative machinery. The preoccupation with administrative problems often results in losing sight of the original objectives underlying the striving for success in bargaining or elections. Specifically, in the face of external threats, the original radical objectives of unions and socialist parties were modified to protect the organizations, and what were once radical reformist movements turned into rather moderate or even conservative organizations.

In old and established bureaucracies the displacement of goals typically assumes the form of a rigid conformity with bureaucratic procedures at the expense of the objectives they were designed to accomplish. This results from bureaucratic pressures and an overemphasis on discipline. Merton analyzed the problem in this way:

> Adherence to the rules, originally conceived as a means, becomes transformed into an end-in-itself; there occurs the familiar process of displacement of goals whereby "an instrumental value becomes a

---

[10] However, the university can afford to be politically neutral only as long as its distinctive character is not threatened.

[11] Robert Michels, Political Parties (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949).

> terminal value." Discipline, readily interpreted as conformance with regulations, whatever the situation, is seen not as a measure designed for specific purposes but becomes an immediate value in the life-organization of the bureaucrat. This emphasis, resulting from the displacement of the original goals, develops into rigidities and an inability to adjust readily.[12]

In other words, conformity with procedures and, generally, concern with administrative problems, which are necessary means to insure the organization's survival and the achievement of its goals, become ends-in-themselves, displacing the original goals of the organization.

Merton's analysis reveals the theoretical principle underlying bureaucratization, but there is a danger of drawing misleading implications from it. Ritualism is not due simply to bureaucratic pressures to conform. In fact, bureaucrats do not always manifest the displacement of goals but sometimes the opposite tendency.

It may be instructive at this point to raise the question, "Who are the ritualists?" A clue to the answer is provided by the reactions to the introduction of a major change in official regulations in a government law enforcement agency I once had the opportunity to observe. On purely rational grounds, the least experienced officials who did not know the old regulations well should object least to having to learn new ones. Actually, *these officials were more likely to object to the change than the most experienced* and competent officials. The inference to be drawn here is that insecurity leads to a resistance to change. Indeed, other observations of the agency indicated that rigid conformity usually occurred when officials were fearful about displeasing their superiors.

It appears that the source of unthinking conformity in bureaucracies is not merely the result of the pressure of bureaucratic rules and procedures. Established rules that limit discretion do not by themselves create ritualistic tendencies, as the creative scientist who rigidly conforms to scientific procedures vividly illustrates. Instead, it is the insecurity generated by the bureaucratic hierarchy of authority that is to blame. Rigid conformity with official rules protects the dependent subordinate who is anxious about the reaction of his superior. In other words, the anxiety engendered by dependence seems to promote compulsive conformity.

The process of displacement of goals which Michels described is not observed in all unions. On the contrary, many American unions reveal the opposite tendency. Once earlier union objectives have been achieved, they are used as stepping stones to achieve further reforms. This process by which earlier goals, once achieved, are succeeded by more advanced ones, which is just the opposite of the displacement of goals, can be termed the succession of goals.

---

[12] Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (2nd ed., Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957), p. 199. (Italics in original.)

The same process of succession of goals was observed in the law enforcement agency. Officials in this New Deal agency did not withdraw from the original objectives. Instead, they advocated new reform programs that would create new challenges, making their work more interesting and necessitating staff expansions that would avert the threat of layoff and improve the opportunities for promotion of the present personnel.[13]

What conditions determine which process occurs—the displacement of goals or the succession of goals? The different outcomes cannot be attributed to the greater idealism of American trade union leaders compared with their German counterparts, but they are due to existential conditions. Contrasting interests of organizational leadership develop in different external situations. In imperial Germany the threat to the survival of the union and the leaders' positions in it led to the displacement of goals as a defensive mechanism to protect the organization's existence. In America during a period of industrial expansion, the relatively rapid achievement of initial union objectives threatened to make the organization and its leadership unimportant for workers. But striving for new objectives that benefited workers made them important again. Similarly, once the initial objectives of the New Deal agency had been accomplished, the psychological and economic self-interest of the officials induced them to advocate new goals. Here again the conclusion is that the absence of basic threats to security prevents such bureaucratic tendencies as the displacement of goals and resistance to change.

By granting tenure, a university guarantees a considerable measure of financial and psychological security to its faculty members. The assumption is that tenure has the function of preventing the insecurity that would impede creativity. However, early creativity poses an apparent contradiction to this assumption. Particularly in the natural sciences, a man usually does his most creative work in his late twenties or early thirties. This may be the time when intellectual challenge and informal social support are at their peak, though institutionalized forms of social support, such as tenure, generally are not granted until later in a man's career. To be sure, even if tenure reduces the productivity of the large majority but furthers the creative achievements of just a few, the resulting social benefits may well be worth this cost to society. But the effect of tenure may be just the opposite—instead of freeing scientists to concentrate on their work it may induce them to relax their efforts. Although the significance of tenure for freedom of inquiry makes it essential in many fields, it is not at all clear whether its effects on scientific or scholarly productivity are primarily beneficial or detrimental.

---

[13] Peter M. Blau, The Dynamics of Bureaucracy (rev. ed., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), pp. 231-49.

The Dynamics of Creative Research

The paradox of creative research is that the opposite conditions in the environment are required to stimulate it. The achievement of new insights is furthered by security, on the one hand, and by challenge, on the other. The social environment must furnish secure support to a man lest he dare not venture into uncharted areas. However, security alone is not enough. If it were, the university system of granting tenure would assure significant contributions on the part of all senior faculty members. Of course, there must be adequate ability. In addition, there must be a challenge to a man's imagination and an anxious concern with meeting the challenge, as well as social support in his endeavors to do so. Moreover, incentives are necessary to secure the investment of energy underlying original ideas and creative research.

Three points can be made in exploring the paradox that creative research depends on both supportive approval for a man's ideas and critical challenges to them. First, original studies are said to entail essentially a novel recombination of existing elements from diverse areas. Even the most original invention is built on the foundation of many previous discoveries and constitutes a new reorganization of different old elements. Therefore, exposure to various views that challenge one's own should stimulate creativity.[14] However, for a man to expose himself to such challenges requires that he be sufficiently secure.

---

[14] See Donald C. Pelz, "Conditions for Innovation," Trans-action, no. 2 (1965), pp. 32-34.

The second aspect of the paradox is that venturing into new fields involves grave risks. When safe paths are abandoned, the highly original is initially hardly distinguishable from the entirely absurd. Furthermore, one may devote years of effort to a line of inquiry that may fail to produce results. There are a number of indications that taking risks and welcoming the challenge of new experiences requires a secure base of support. As we have seen, the government agency officials who were the least secure in their knowledge were the most resistant to change in organizational procedures. In the army, discipline facilitates coping with the constantly changing battle situations. A study of trade-union participation found that the more secure, higher-status workers are more prone to take the risk of organizing unions than the most deprived workers, who stand to benefit most by the establishment of unions.[15] Nevertheless, security can lull a man to sleep unless there is a challenge to be overcome, but it is extremely difficult to predict in advance what balance of security and challenge will be optimum for a particular individual or what constitutes an appropriate challenge.

The gratification derived from games and sociability provides a final way of examining the paradox, for they reveal the same double contingency of security and challenge.[16] Unless games, sports, or sociable occasions constitute a challenge, they are boring rather than enjoyable. However, if the challenge they pose is too great and endangers our basic security, these occasions are not enjoyable but distressing. In such a situation, our typical reaction is to retreat from the challenge instead of meeting it. Strong involvement in scientific as well as in sociable activity depends upon anxious concern with success, kept within bounds lest the anxiety become debilitating.

Implications for Social Communication

Extensive communication and free discussion among scientists and scholars tend to promote creative research, since they simultaneously provide social support for original ideas and critical challenges to improve them further. The proliferation of professional journals and meetings affords opportunities for formal communication and also for some informal discussions. A more systematic example is provided by Shepard's study of a university research group.[17] Shepard found that the research engineers in the organization he studied freely discussed research problems with their colleagues, and he judged that these communications stimulated ideas and raised research productivity. A study of government officials also concluded that consultation among peers facilitated decision making.[18]

---

[15] See William Spinrad, "Correlates of Trade Union Participation," American Sociological Review, no. 25 (1960), pp. 237-44.

[16] See Erving Goffman, Encounters (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961).

The process of making decisions in order to reach a conclusion, particularly an original one, is likely to engender anxiety. The consequent blocking of ideas interferes with reaching a solution of the problem. Under these conditions the supportive approval of colleagues in a discussion, manifested in attentive listening and appreciative comments, serves to relieve anxiety and thereby facilitates proceeding with further ideas. The reduction of anxiety itself tends to improve problem solving even when colleagues give no explicit advice. The experience of regularly being asked by others for advice increases one's confidence, and it also may serve as a means of acquiring informal status and thus as an informal reward system. In addition, the process of consultation provides challenges and incentives for creative problem solving.

The significance of both challenge and support is brought into high relief by a study that raises the question of whether it is more beneficial for research performance to consult colleagues whose values are similar to one's own or to consult those whose values are different. In an investigation of a government medical-research organization, Pelz found that scientific performance was improved by a specific consultation pattern.[19] If the orientation of a researcher's five most frequently consulted colleagues was similar to his own, then frequency of consultation was not related to his performance. However, if their orientations were different from his, then frequent contacts with them were associated with improved performance. These results were reversed when only the orientation of the researcher's closest colleague was considered. If the closest colleague's orientation was different from that of the respondent, frequency of contact was inversely related to performance, but if the two individuals shared the same orientation, then frequency of contact was directly associated with research performance. These empirical findings imply that colleagues with a similar approach provide social support for ideas, while those with a different approach offer critical challenges. Optimum research performance appeared to depend on both supportive approval and challenging criticisms. However, the correlations found by Penz may have been due in part to the opposite causal nexus: superior researchers are probably more likely than their less competent fellows to discuss problems with men whose different orientation may pose a challenge to their ideas. The inference is that a degree of basic security is required before one will risk exposure to challenges.

---

[17] Herbert A. Shepard, "The Value System of a University Research Group," American Sociological Review, no. 19 (1954), pp. 456-62.

[18] Blau, op. cit., pp. 122-37.

[19] Donald C. Pelz, "Some Factors Related to Performance in a Research Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, no. 1 (1956), pp. 310-25.

Finally, the communication among scientists and scholars provides important incentives for creative work. When a man's discussion of his research and its problems impresses his colleagues, he earns their approval and respect. The major reward of original scholarship is the fame and reputation it may bring to a man, but this is a long-range reward, often realized long after the completion of the work. Major awards, honorary degrees, and wide renown tend to occur rather late in a man's career, while, especially in the natural sciences, the first decade of work is often the most creative. Also, recognition and fame may come only posthumously, so that its anticipation is all that can be enjoyed.

In this context, earning the respect of expert colleagues through discussions with them provides intervening incentives. It represents a down payment of the rewards for originality and effort, while the balance lies in the uncertain future. The short-run reward of approval from immediate colleagues encourages the anticipation of the ultimate reward of widespread recognition and spurs a man on to further research endeavors. Hence, the competition for respect that occurs in communication among colleagues constitutes an important incentive system. Essential contributions to science and scholarship are often prompted by the desire to outdo or to disprove someone else in the field.

Implications for University Structure

Now we shall turn to the significance of the university structure for promoting or restricting communication and discussion. The distinction between invention and innovation noted earlier is pertinent here, as it was in the context of the internal dynamics of social change. Wilson suggests that original ideas and creative inventions are more likely to be conceived in complex and diverse organizations than in small ones.[20] He argues that the greater the diversity of the organization (the more varied both the tasks performed and the incentives provided) the greater is the likelihood that some members will conceive new ideas, and also that they will propose that these inventions be adopted. His reasoning is that a complex division of labor with a great variety of specialists raises the opportunity for contact with diverse ideas and orientations and the possibility of obtaining informal rewards, such as respect, from different sources, in addition to the formal rewards offered by the organization itself. As we have seen before, both intellectual stimulation and environmental support are beneficial to creativity. Besides, a large organization is required for each man to have not only some colleagues in related fields but also a group which enables him to discuss problems with fellow specialists as well as with men whose viewpoint and background are different from his own.

For these reasons, the structure of large and complex universities is advantageous for invention, quite aside from their greater material resources, which are also needed to support modern research. But while complexity promotes the conception and discussion of new ideas, according to Wilson, it discourages their implementation and adoption—that is, innovation—because the complexity of the organization raises the cost of introducing change. Since the main function of the university is to stimulate invention rather than innovation directly, this is not as serious a problem for universities as for other organizations. However, some implementation of ideas is often required to bring creative efforts to fruition. Hence, universities too must face the problem of overcoming resistance to innovation. Needed innovations within the university may involve departmental reorganization, reallocation of teaching loads or laboratory facilities, or special arrangements for forums or seminars. More important than such specific innovations, however, is a climate within a university that encourages contemplation of the university's purposes and far-reaching experimentation with various ways of attaining its goals. If large universities aspire to be great universities, they must be willing to bear not only the higher cost of implementation due to complexity but also the costs of self-criticism and internal reorganization which may increase complexity still further.

---

[20] James Q. Wilson, "Innovation in Organization: Notes Toward a Theory" (mimeographed).

Let us draw some inferences about which conditions in the university structure are optimum for creative research. First of all, as Wilson indicated, large and complex universities provide better conditions than small colleges, specialized schools, and research institutes. A diverse environment offers intellectual stimulation while a sufficiently large ingroup provides intellectual and social support. Second, there should be ample opportunity for communication among colleagues. Thus, faculty clubs are good investments, as are offices that invite working on campus rather than at home. A residential community that offers faculty members proximity both to the university and to each other may also be advantageous. Third, administrative processes, by interfering with decision making, allocation of resources, feedback, and evaluation, can block the implementation of innovative ideas; such blocks must be minimized.[21] Fourth, it is necessary to furnish both security and challenges through a double incentive system. On the one hand, tenure and adequate salaries provide a secure base for creative innovations; on the other hand, the high prestige the university community bestows upon its outstanding scholars serves as an incentive for creative research.[22] In other words, the incentive of tenure provides security, and the incentive of prestige and future fame provides a continuing challenge. These two incentives function in quite different ways. While tenure entails rewarding many faculty members to elicit an outstanding contribution from a small proportion of them, fame implies that an extremely high reward promised to very few serves as an incentive to spur the efforts of many more.[23]

---

[21] James Thompson, "How to Prevent Innovation," Trans-action, no. 2 (1965), p. 30.

[22] Presthus, op. cit., p. 241, and others have complained that administrators tend to receive higher salaries than faculty members. I think this actually may be a good sign, though it is not necessarily one. In a first-rate university, administrators must receive higher salaries than faculty members, for it is the only incentive to become an administrator since scholarship and research win a man much higher prestige. The implication is, of course, that in the best universities the highest respect of the academic community is actually reserved for scholarship.

[23] The incentive system in art is similar to the prestige system in academic circles. A tiny fraction of artists get the tremendous reward of lasting fame. This provides incentives for large numbers of artists to devote their efforts to the production of art, although they may have to live in garrets while doing so.

Selznick distinguishes executive leadership from administrative man agement, and he characterizes the former as being oriented to the organ zation, not merely as an efficiency instrument, but as a natural institutio with its own dynamics.[24] The implications of this conception are that the manager conceives of his responsibility as finding the most efficient sol tion to administrative problems, while the executive leader accepts the premise that dynamic developments produce dilemmas that cannot be definitively resolved. Hence, the executive leader does not impose solution once and for all, but he accepts responsibility for making recurrent rea justments.

Dilemmas

A dilemma differs from a problem because it has two horns and thu no single optimum solution. Consequently, a remedial action in one respt typically intensifies difficulties in another, requiring further remedial a tion. Besides, the more complex an organization is, the wider the unintended ramifications of remedial action, and the more extensive and costly e counter-remedies that will be required. Social life continually poses dilmmas, and the four traits of universities discussed earlier direct our att tion to some of the particular dilemmas of these institutions of higher learning.

The reversal of staff and line in universities, the first trait discussd, means that professional experts without administrative authority perfor not merely auxiliary functions but the major functions of the organizatio This poses dilemmas for faculty recruitment.[25] On the one hand, the ad ministrator must rely on faculty recommendations in promotions and ne appointments, since he is not qualified to judge professional competenc in all the fields under his jurisdiction. Furthermore, he dares not clain such authority, lest he undermine faculty autonomy and thereby impede its contributions. On the other hand, the administrator must not rely on faculty recommendations, because if he does he cannot create a social environment conducive to creative research. A weak faculty cannot be expected to favor the appointment of stronger men, and even a strong faculty is likely to favor men with orientations similar to their own, to the detriment of diversity of approaches. In addition, informal relations make it difficult for the faculty to deny promotion to an insider in favor of an outsider.

---

[24] Philip Selznick, Leadership in Administration (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957), pp. 4-5.

[25] The problems and dilemmas involved in faculty recruitment a discussed at some length in Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, The Academic Marketplace (New York: Basic Books, 1958), pp. 109-69, 182 92.

Considering the second trait, the fact that students, in contrast to clients in other organizations, are not outside the university's boundaries but in many respects part of it poses the dilemma of student autonomy versus regulation. Autonomy is essential, both for maturation at this stage in life and for the development of independent citizens in a democracy. Hence, students should also have the autonomy to organize and to engage in political activity. But the regulations that restrict autonomy serve important functions, too, for the training of students in the discipline needed to become scholars or scientists or just responsible adults, and for the research pursuits of the faculty to be protected from interference by involvement with student matters. In other words, some measure of regulation simply makes life more certain and predictable, and like discipline in the army, it frees energy and attention for more important concerns.

The third distinctive trait of universities, their twofold purpose, poses several dilemmas. One is the dilemma of the local versus the cosmopolitan orientation.[26] The former involves concentration on the development of students and the training of future scientists, and it requires a commitment to education on the part of the faculty as well as deep involvement in the local university community. The advancement of science and scholarship, by contrast, requires a cosmopolitan orientation to colleagues in one's specialty throughout the world. A parallel dilemma is reflected in faculty appointments. Appointing the university's own graduate increases commitment to the particular university culture at the expense of impersonal scientific criteria. On the other hand, appointing outsiders on the basis of merit raises standards and diversity at the expense of an integrated university community.

Another aspect of this dilemma is faculty turnover.[27] If the faculty

---

26. Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals," Administrative Science Quarterly, no. 2 (1957-1958), pp. 281-306, 444-80.

27. Caplow and McGee, op. cit., pp. 233-35.

does not have strong local commitments, career advancements will lead to high rates of turnover, and for all universities but the most prestigeful this means that their best faculty members are likely to be recruited to other institutions. While this exodus of talent is disadvantageous in itself, it is a sign of good health, not of poor health, for it shows that the quality of the university's faculty is so high that others are eager to recruit from its members. Besides, it provides opportunities for recruiting fresh blood from the outside, which may well invigorate creative scholarship.

Finally, the university's attempt to institutionalize and regularize original and creative work leads to dilemmas. The dilemma posed by the need for both security and challenge has been discussed earlier at length. To summarize the argument briefly, the security of tenure, which is intended to help men take the risk entailed by original work, may also relieve the motivation of faculty members to devote sustained effort to their work. The other horn of the dilemma is that the competition for respect among colleagues, which serves to incite men to greater efforts, may instead produce debilitating threats. There is another dilemma which confronts the individual scientist; with fame as the spur, he is expected to devote his life to do his best to make his students such good scientists that they will make his own work obsolete.

Dialectical Developments

Change assumes a dialectical pattern, in universities as elsewhere. Indeed, the very concept of dilemma implies this, for any adjustment made to improve some conditions in the organization worsens others, thereby creating needs for further readjustments.

By way of illustration, if the administration devotes resources to rebuilding the faculty and invigorating it with new blood to create a more stimulating research environment, it may thereby also undermine faculty autonomy and produce dissatisfaction and conflict. Thus, the net effect may be to impede research productivity rather than to facilitate it. Furthermore, since the more cosmopolitan research-oriented faculty is less concerned with local problems of student life, students may well become alienated and rebellious.

As faculty complaints and conflicts increase, attention may be devoted to dealing with them. Two alternative courses of action come readily to mind. One possibility is to strengthen faculty autonomy by giving faculty members more voice in determining departmental and university policy and by reducing the power of the department heads and deans. This may make the future recruitment of outside faculty more difficult, because the faculty may have sufficient strength and cohesion to insist that recruitment and promotion take place primarily within the departments. A second possibility is to lighten the teaching load. However, this would intensify the problems of the students, for more responsibility for their instruction would fall to graduate assistants, classes with first-rate professors would become too large for the students to establish any personal contact with their professors, and the variety of courses offered might be substantially cut.

The growing alienation and rebelliousness of the students (or their increasing apathy and a declining number and quality of applicants for admission) may now call attention to their educational needs. Thus a new era sets in, during which much energy is devoted to the teaching function of the university. This may be manifest in revising the curriculum, appointing counselors, rewarding faculty for outstanding teaching, and reallocating funds to scholarships. If this concentration upon student growth and training is successful, it may produce such promising young scholars that many of them leave for better institutions. This is particularly apt to happen if the development of bright, budding scientists interferes with the research productivity of the faculty, as well it might. In this case, one may anticipate a new era in which demands are made for greater emphasis on research and less on teaching. These are merely a few examples of the criss-crossing currents that produce a dialectical pattern of change.

Concluding Remarks

Assuming the analysis presented is valid, this situation presents a serious challenge to university leadership. The university administration has the responsibility to create those conditions in the social structure that promote creativity and research productivity among its faculty. Simultaneously, it should create conditions that stimulate an interest on the part of its faculty in the education and growth of its students and, particularly in the extension divisions, of the larger adult community.

This responsibility is an unending task, because any improvement accomplished is also likely to create new problems requiring further improvements. Moreover, it is a responsibility that necessitates a high degree of tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty. Whereas the routine administrator seeks final solutions that, once found, are rigidly imposed, university leadership must, in contrast, let developments take their course, knowing full well that many of them will recreate a problem that once seemed to have been solved. It is also a responsibility that requires self-denial, since the university executive must help faculty members achieve a renown which is beyond his grasp.

Parallel dilemmas confront the university leadership and its faculty. The executive must create conditions that enable the faculty to overshadow him, just as the scientist must train and inspire students who can one day overshadow him. Both positions require the combination of security and challenge that enable a man to cope with such dilemmas.

ERIC Clearinghouse
APR 11 1969
on Adult Education